NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXXXIII.

JUNE, 1905.

NEW ENGLAND: AN AUTUMN IMPRESSION.

IN THREE PARTS: PART THIRD.

BY HENRY JAMES.

VI.

It is a convenience to be free to confess that the play of perception during those first weeks was quickened, in the oddest way, by the wonderment (which was partly also the amusement) of my finding how many corners of the general, of the local, picture had anciently never been unveiled for me at all, and how many unveiled too briefly and too scantly, with quite insufficient bravery of gesture. That might make one ask by what strange law one had lived in the other time, with gaps, to that number, in one's experience, in one's consciousness, with so many muffled spots in one's general vibration—and the answer indeed to such a question might carry with it an infinite penetration of retrospect, a penetration productive of ghostly echoes as sharp sometimes as aches or pangs. So many had been the easy things, the contiguous places, the conspicuous objects, to right or to left of the path, that had been either unaccountably or all too inevitably left undiscovered, and which were to live on, to the inner vision, through the long years as mere blank faces, round, empty, metallic, senseless disks dangling from familiar and reiterated names. Why, at the same time, one might ask, had the con-

Copyright, 1905, by The North American Review Publishing Company All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sciousness of irritation from these vain forms not grown greater? why had the inconvenience, or the disgrace, of early privation become an accepted memory? All, doubtless, in the very interest, precisely, of this eventual belated romance, and so that adventures, even of minor type, so preposterously postponed should be able to deck themselves at last with a kind of accumulation of freshness.

So the freshness, all the autumn, kept breaking through the staleness—when the staleness, so agreeably flavored with hospitality, and indeed with new ingredients, was a felt element at all. There was after all no moment perhaps at which one element stood out so very sharply from the other—the hundred emendations and retouches of the old picture, its greater depth of tone, greater show of detail, greater size and scale, tending by themselves to confound and mislead, in a manner, the lights and shades of remembrance. Very promptly, in the Boston neighborhoods, the work of time loomed large, and the difference made by it, as one might say, for the general richness. The richness might have its poverties still and the larger complexity its crudities; but, all the same, to look back was to seem to have been present at an extraordinary general process, that of the rapid, that of the ceaseless relegation of the *previous* (on the part of the whole visible order) to one of the wan categories of misery. What was taking place was a perpetual repudiation of the past, so far as there had been a past to repudiate, so far as the past was a positive rather than a negative quantity. There had been plenty in it, assuredly, of the negative, and that was but a shabbiness to disown or a deception to expose; yet there had been an old conscious commemorated life too, and it was this that had become the victim of supersession. The pathos, so to call it, of the impression was, somehow, that it didn't, the earlier, simpler condition, still resist, or protest, or at all expressively flush through; it was consenting to become a past with all the fine candor with which it had tried to affirm itself, in its day, as a present—and very much, for that matter, as with a due ironic forecast of the fate in store for the hungry, triumphant actual.

This savors perhaps of distorted reflection, but there was really a light over it in which the whole spectacle was to shine. *The will to grow* was everywhere written large, and to grow at no matter what or whose expense. I had naturally seen it before, I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had seen it, on the other side of the world, in a thousand places and forms, a thousand hits and misses: these things are the very screeches of the pipe to which humanity is actually dancing. But here, clearly, it was a question of scale and space and chance, margin and elbow-room, the quantity of floor and loudness of the dance-music; a question of the ambient air, above all, the permitting medium, which had at once, for the visitor's personal inhalation, a dry taste in the mouth. Thin and clear and colorless, what would it ever say "no" to? or what would it ever paint thick, indeed, with sympathy and sanction? With so little, accordingly, within the great frame of the picture, to prevent or to prescribe, it was as if anything might be done there that any sufficient number of subscribers to any sufficient number of sufficiently noisy newspapers might want. That, moreover, was but another name for the largest and straightest perception the restless analyst had yet risen to—the perception that awaits the returning absentee from this great country, on the wharf of disembarkation, with an embodied intensity that no superficial confusion, no extremity of chaos, any more than any brief mercy of accident, avails to mitigate. The waiting observer need be little enough of an analyst, in truth, to arrive at that consciousness, for the phenomenon is vivid in direct proportion as the ship draws near. The great presence that bristles for him on the sounding dock, and that shakes the planks, the loose boards of its theatric stage, to an inordinate unprecedented rumble, is the monstrous form of Democracy, which is thereafter to project its shifting angular shadow, at one time and another, across every inch of the field of his vision. It is the huge democratic broom that has made the clearance and that one seems to see brandished in the empty sky.

That is of course, on one side, no great discovery, for what does even the simplest soul ever sail westward for, at this time of day, if not to profit, so far as possible, by "the working of democratic institutions"? The political, the civic, the economic view of them is a study that may be followed, more or less, at a distance; but the way in which they determine and qualify manners, feelings, communications, modes of contact and conceptions of life—this is a revelation that has its full force and its lively interest only on the spot, where, when once caught, it becomes the only clue worth mentioning in the labyrinth. The condition,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

notoriously, represents an immense boon, but what does the enjoyment of the boon represent? The clue is never out of your hands, whatever other objects, extremely disconnected from it, may appear at the moment to fill them. The democratic consistency, consummately and immitigably complete, shines through with its hard light, whatever equivocal gloss may happen momentarily to prevail. You may talk of other things, and you do, as much as possible; but you are really thinking of that one, which has everything else at its mercy. What indeed is this circumstance that the condition is thus magnified but the commanding value of the picture, its message and challenge to intelligent curiosity? Curiosity is fairly fascinated by the sense of the immensity of the chance, and by the sense that the whole of the chance has been taken. It is rarely given to us to see a great game played as to the very end—and that was where, with his impression of nothing to prevent, of nothing, anywhere around him, to prevent anything, the ancient contemplative person, floating serenely in his medium, had yet occasionally to gasp before the assault of the quantity of illustration. The illustration might be, enormously, of something deficient, absent—in which case it was for the aching void to be (as an aching void) striking and interesting. As an explication or an implication the democratic intensity could always figure.

VII.

There was little need, for that matter, to drag it into the foreground on the evening of my renewed introduction to the particular Boston neighborhood—the only one of them all—with which I had been formerly somewhat acquainted. I had alighted in New York but three days before, and my senses were all so full of it that as I look back I can again feel it, under the immediate Cambridge impression, assert itself by turning quite to insidious softness, to confused and surprised recognition. I had driven out from Boston through the warm September night and through a town-picture as of extraordinary virtuous vacancy (with not so much as the figure of a policeman in sight, from the South Station to the region of Harvard Square), and I remember how the odorous hour—charged with the old distinctively American earth-smell, which, in the darkness, fairly poetized the suburbs, and with the queer, far, wild throb of shrilling insects—prescribed to me the exact form of the response to the question as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to one's sense of a "great change" already so often sounded. "A great change? No change at all. Where then would the 'intensity' be? But *changes*—ever so many and so amusing and so agreeable. The intensity is compatible with *them*—nothing, clearly, is going to be so interesting as to make out, with plenty of good-will, how compatible!" There was unmistakably everywhere a more embroidered surface—the new free figures played over the canvas; so that at this rate, in the time to come, how far might the embroidery not go, what silk and gold mightn't it weave into the pattern? It wasn't of course a question of rhapsodizing—Cambridge was Cambridge still, and all faithful to its type; but the rustle of the trees in the summer night had a larger tone, the more frequent lamplight slept upon ampler walls, the body of impression was greater and the University, above all, seemed in more confident possession. It massed there in multiplied forms, with new and strange architectures looming through the dark; it appeared to have wandered wide and to be stretching forth, in many directions, long, acquisitive arms.

This vision, for the moment, of a great dim, clustered but restlessly expansive Harvard, hushed to vacation stillness as to a deep ambitious dream, was, for the impressible story-seeker, practically the germ of the most engaging of the generalized images of reassurance, the furniture, so to speak, of the *other* scale, that the extension of his view was to cause him to cultivate. Reassurance is required, before the spectacle of American manners at large, whenever one most acutely perceives how little honor they tend to heap on the art of discrimination, and it is at such hours that, turning in his frequent stupefaction, the restless analyst reaches out for support to the nearest faint ghost of a constituted Faculty. It takes no exceptional exposure to the promiscuous life to show almost any institution pretending to university form as stamped here with the character and function of the life-saving monasteries of the dark ages. They glow, the humblest of them, to the imagination—the imagination that fixes the surrounding scene as a huge Rappacini garden rank with each variety of the poison-plant of the money-passion—they glow with all the vividness of the defined alternative, the possible antidote, and seem to call upon us to blow upon the flame till it is made inextinguishable. So little time had it taken, at any rate, to suggest to us that a new and higher price, in American conditions, is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attaching to the cloister, literally—the place inaccessible (to put it most pertinently) to the shout of the newspaper, the place to perambulate, the place to think, apart from the crowd. Doubtless indeed I was not all aware of it at the time, but the image I touch upon in connection with those first moments was to remain with me, the figure of the rich old Harvard organism brooding, exactly, through the long vacation, brooding through the summer night, on discriminations, on insistencies, on sublime and exquisite heresies to come.

After that arrived daylight recognitions, but they were really for the most part offered me, as in a full cup, by the accident of a couple of hours that were to leave me the pure essence, the finer sense of them. These were a matter of a fortnight later, as I had had immediately to make an absence, and the waning September afternoon of the second occasion took on a particular quality for this deferred surrender of a dozen stored secrets. "Secrets" I call them because the total impression was of the production of some handful of odds and ends that had lurked, for long, in a locked drawer, and which, being brought out, might promote, by their blinking consciousness, either derision or respect. They excited, as befell, an extraordinary tenderness—on which conclusion it was fortunate to be able afterwards to rest. I wandered, for the day's end, with a young modern for whom the past had not been and who was admirably unconscious of the haunting moral of the whole mutation—the tune to which the pampered present made the other time look comparatively grim. Each item of the pampered state contributed to this effect—the finer *mise-en-scène,* the multiplied resources, halls, faculties, museums, undergraduate and postgraduate habitations (these last of so large a luxury); the pompous little club-houses, visited, all vacant, in the serious telltale twilight that seemed to give them, intellectually, "away"; the beautiful new Union, with its great grave noble hall, of which there would be so much more to be said; and above all, doubtless, the later majesties of the Law School, in the near presence of which the tiny old disinherited seat of that subject, outfaced and bedimmed, seemed unable to make even a futile plea for quaintness. I went into the new Law Library, immense and supreme—in the shadow of which I caught myself sniffing the very dust, prehistoric but still pungent, of the old. I saw in the distance a distinguished friend, all alone, be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

latedly working there, but to go to him I should have had to cross the bridge that spans the gulf of time, and, with a suspicion of weak places, I was nervous about its bearing me.

What such delicacies came to, then and afterwards, for the whole impression, was the instinct not to press, not to push on, till forced, through any half-open door of the real. The real was there, certainly enough, outside and all round, but there was standing-ground, more immediately, for a brief idyl, and one would walk in the idyl, if only from hour to hour, while one could. This could but mean that one would cultivate the idyllic, for the social, for the pictorial illusion, by every invoking and caressing art; and in fact, as a consequence, the reflection of our observer's experience for the next few weeks—that is so long as the spell of the autumn lasted—would be but the history of his more or less ingenious arts. With the breaking of the autumn, later on, everything broke, everything went—everything was transposed at least into another key. But for the time so much had been gained—the happy trick had been played.

VIII.

It was after all in the great hall of the Union perhaps (to come back to that delicate day's end) that the actual vibration of response seemed most to turn to audible music—repeated, with all its suggestiveness, on another occasion or two. For the case was unmistakably that just there, more than anywhere, by a magnificent stroke, an inspiration working perhaps even beyond its consciousness, the right provision had been made for the remembering mind. The place was addressed in truth so largely to an enjoying and producing future that it might seem to frown on mere commemoration, on the backward vision; and yet, at the moment I speak of, its very finest meaning might have been that of a liberal monument to those who had come and gone, to the company of the lurking ghosts. The air was full of them, and this was its service, that it cared for them *all*, and thus eased off the intensity of their appeal. And yet it appeared to play that part for a reason more interesting than reducible to words—a reason that mainly came out for me while, in the admirable hall aforesaid, I stood before Sargent's high portrait of Major Henry Lee Higginson, *donatorio* of the house (as well as author, all roundabout, of innumerable other civil gifts); a representative

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of life and character, a projection of genius, which even that great painter has never outdone. Innumerable, ever, are the functions performed and the blessings wrought by the supreme work of art, but I know of no case in which it has been so given to such a work to make the human statement with a great effect, to interfuse a group of public acts with the personality, with the characteristics, of the actor. The acts would still have had all their value if the portrait had had less, but they would not assuredly have been able to become so interesting, would not have grown to affect each beneficiary, however obscure, as proceeding, for him, from a possible relation, a possible intimacy. It is to the question of intimacy with somebody or other that all great practical public recognition is finally carried back—but carried only by the magic carpet, when the magic carpet happens to be there. Mr. Sargent's portrait of Henry Higginson is exactly the magic carpet.

That was the "pull" (one kept on feeling) that this happy commemorative creation of the Union had over the great official, the great bristling brick, Valhalla of the early "seventies," that house of honor and of hospitality which, under the name of the Alumni Hall, dispenses (apart from its containing a noble auditorium) laurels to the dead and dinners to the living. The recording tablets of the members of the University sacrificed, on the Northern side, in the Civil War, are too impressive not to retain here, always, their collective beauty; but the monumental office and character suffer throughout from the too scant presence of the massive and the mature. The great structure spreads and soars with the best will in the world, but succeeds in resembling rather some high-masted ship at sea, in slightly prosaic equilibrium, than a thing of builded foundations and embrasured walls. To which it is impossible not immediately to add that these distinctions are relative and these comparisons almost odious, in face of the recent generations, gathered in from beneath emptier skies, who must have found in the big building as it stands an admonition and an ideal. So much the better for the big building, assuredly, and none so calculably the worse for the generations themselves. The reflection follows close moreover that, tactfully speaking, criticism has no close concern with Alumni Hall; it is as if that grim visitor found the approaches closed to him—had to enter, to the loss of all his identity, some relaxing air of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mere sentimental, mere shameless association. He turns his back, a trifle ruefully whistling, and wanders wide; so at least I seemed to see him do, all September, all October, and hereabouts in particular: I felt him resignedly reduced, for the time, to looking over, to looking through, the fence—all the more that, at Cambridge, there was at last something in the nature of a fence so to be dealt with.

The smaller aspects, the sight of mere material arrears made up, may seem unduly to have held me when I say that few fresh circumstances struck me as falling more happily into the picture than this especial decency of the definite, the palpable affirmation and belated delimitation of College Yard. The high, decorated, recurrent gates and the still insufficiently high iron palings —representing a vast ring and even now incomplete—may appear, in spots, extemporized and thin; but that signifies little in presence of the precious idea on the side of which, in the land of the "open door," the all abstract outline, the timid term and the general concession, they bravely range themselves. The open door—as it figures here in respect to everything but trade—may make a magnificent place, but it makes poor places; and in places, despite our large mistrust of privacy, and until the national ingenuity shall have invented a substitute for them, we must content ourselves with living. This especial drawing of the belt at Harvard is an admirably interesting example of the way in which the formal enclosure of objects at all interesting immediately refines upon their interest, immediately establishes values. The enclosure may be impressive from without, but from within it is delicious; nothing is more curious than to trace in the aspects so controlled the effect of their established relation to it. This resembles, in the human or social order, the improved situation of the foundling who has discovered his family or of the actor who has mastered his part.

The older buildings, in the Yard, profit indeed, on the spot, to the story-seeking mind, by the fact of their comparative exhibition of the tone of time—so prompt an ecstasy and so deep a relief reward, in America, everywhere, any suggested source of interest that is not the interest of importunate newness. That source overflows, all others run thin; but the wonder and the satisfaction are that in College Yard more than one of these should have finally been set to running thick. The best pieces

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the earlier cluster, from Massachusetts to Stoughton, emerge from their elongation of history with a paler archaic pink in their brickwork; their scant primitive details, small "quaintnesses" of form, have turned, each, to the expressive accent that no short-cut of "style" can ever successfully imitate, and from their many-paned windows, where, on the ensconced benches, so many generations have looked out, they fall, in their minor key, into the great main current of ghostly gossip. "See, see, we are getting on, we are getting almost ripe, ripe enough to justify the question of taste about us. We are growing a complexion—which takes almost as long, and is in fact pretty well the same thing, as growing a philosophy; but we are putting it on and entering into the dignity of time, the beauty of life. We are in a word beginning to begin, and we have that best sign of it, haven't we? that we make the vulgar, the very vulgar, think we are beginning to end."

That moreover was not the only relation thus richly promoted; there could be no unrest of analysis worthy of the name that failed to perceive how, after term had opened, the type of the young men coming and going in the Yard gained, for vivacity of appeal, through this more marked constitution of a *milieu* for it. Here, verily, questions could swarm; for there was scarce an impression of the local life at large that didn't play into them. One thing I had not yet done—I had not been, under the best guidance, out to Ellis Island, the seat of the Commissioner of Immigration, in the bay of New York, to catch in the fact, as I was to catch later on, a couple of hours of the ceaseless process of the recruiting of our race, of the plenishing of our huge national *pot-au-feu,* of the introduction of fresh—of perpetually fresh so far it isn't perpetually stale—foreign matter into our heterogeneous system. But even without that a haunting wonder as to what might be becoming of us all, "typically," ethnically, and thereby physiognomically, linguistically, *personally,* was always in order. The young men in their degree, as they flocked candidly up to college, struck me as having much to say about it, and there was always the sense of light on the subject, for comparison and reference, that a long experience of other types and other manners could supply. Swarming ingenuous youths, *whom did they look like the sons of?*—that inquiry, as to any group, any couple, any case, represented a game that it was posi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tively thrilling to play out. There was plenty to make it so, for there was, to begin with, both the forecast of the thing that might easily settle the issue and the forecast of the thing that might easily complicate it.

No impression so promptly assaults the arriving visitor of the United States as that of the overwhelming preponderance, wherever he turns and twists, of the unmitigated "business man" face, ranging through its various possibilities, its extraordinary actualities, of intensity. And I speak here of facial cast and expression alone, leaving out of account the questions of voice, tone, utterance and attitude, the chorus of which would vastly swell the testimony and in which I seem to discern, for these remarks at large, a treasure of illustration to come. Nothing, meanwhile, is more concomitantly striking than the fact that the women, over the land—allowing for every element of exception—appear to be of a markedly finer texture than the men, and that one of the liveliest signs of this difference is precisely in their less narrowly specialized, their less commercialized, distinctly more generalized, physiognomic character. The superiority thus noted, and which is quite another matter from the universal fact of the mere usual female femininity, is far from constituting absolute distinction, but it constitutes relative, and it is a circumstance at which interested observation snatches, from the first, with an immense sense of its *portée*. There are, with all the qualifications it is yet open to, fifty reflections to be made upon the truth it seems to represent, the appearance of a queer deep split or chasm between the two stages of personal polish, the two levels of the conversible state, at which the sexes have arrived. It is at all events no exaggeration to say that the imagination at once embraces it as *the* feature of the social scene, recognizing it as a subject fruitful beyond the common, and wondering even if for pure drama, the drama of manners, anything anywhere else touches it. If it be a "subject," verily—with the big vision of the intersexual relation as, at such an increasing rate, a prey to it—the right measure for it would seem to be offered in the art of the painter of life by the concrete example, the art of the dramatist or the novelist, rather than in that of the talker, the reporter at large. The only thing is that, from the moment the painter begins to look at American life brush in hand, he is in danger of seeing, in comparison, almost nothing else in it—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing, that is, so characteristic as this apparent privation, for the man, of his right kind of woman, and this apparent privation, for the woman, of her right kind of man.

The right kind of woman for the American man may really be, of course, as things are turning out with him, the woman as to whom his most workable relation is to support her and bear with her—just as the right kind of man for the American woman may really be the man who intervenes in her life only by occult, by barely divinable, by practically disavowed courses. But the ascertainment and illustration of these truths would be, exactly, very conceivably high sport for the ironic poet—who has surely hitherto neglected one of his greatest current opportunities. It in any case remains vivid that American life may, as regards much of its manifestation, fall upon the earnest view as a society of women "located" in a world of men, which is so different a matter from a collection of men of the world; the men supplying, as it were, all the canvas, and the women all the embroidery. Just this vividness it was that held up the torch, through the Cambridge autumn, to that question of the affiliation of the encountered Harvard undergraduate which I may not abandon. In what proportion of instances would it stick out that the canvas, rather than the embroidery, was what he had to show? In what proportion would he wear the stamp of the unredeemed commercialism that should betray its paternity? In what proportion, in his appearance, would the different social "value" imputable to his mother have succeeded in interposing? The discerned answer to these inquiries is really, after all, too precious (in its character of contribution to one's total gathered wisdom), to be given away prematurely; but there was at least always the sense, to which the imagination reverted, that in the collegiate cloisters and academic shades of other countries this absence of a possible range of origin and breeding in a young type had not been so felt. The question of origin, the question of breeding, had been large—never settled in advance; there had been fifty *sorts* of persons, fifty representatives of careers, to whom the English, the French, the German universitarian of tender years might refer you for a preliminary account of him.

I speak of my keeping back, for the present, many of my ultimate perceptions, but I may none the less recall my having had, all the season, from early, the ring in my ears of a reply I had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heard made, on the spot, to a generous lady offering entertainment to a guest, a stranger to the scene, whose good impression she had had at heart. "What kind of people should I like to meet? Why, my dear madam, have you more than *one* kind?" At the same time that I could remember that, however, I could also remember that the consistently *bourgeois* fathers must themselves in many cases have had mothers whose invitation to their male offspring to clutch at their relatively finer type had not succeeded in getting itself accepted. That constituted a fatal precedent, and it would have to be in the female offspring, probably, that one should look for evidences of the clutching—an extension of the inquiry for which there was plenty of time. What did escape from submersion, meanwhile, as is worth mentioning, was the golden state of being reminded, at moments that there are no such pleasure-giving accidents, for the mind, as violations of the usual in conditions that make them really precarious and rare. As the usual, in our vast crude democracy of trade, is the new, the simple, the cheap, the common, the commercial, the immediate, and, all too often, the ugly, any human product that those elements fail conspicuously to involve or to explain, any creature, or even any feature, not turned out to pattern, any form of suggested rarity, subtlety, ancientry, or other pleasant perversity, prepares for us a recognition akin to rapture. These lonely ecstasies of the truly open sense make up often, in the hustling, bustling desert, for such "sinkings" of the starved stomach as have led one too often to have to tighten one's æsthetic waistband.

IX.

All of which is sufficiently to imply, again, that for adventurous contemplation, at any of the beguiled hours of which I pretend here but to give the general happier drift, there was scarce such a thing as a variation of insistence. As every fact was convertible into a fancy, there was only an encouraged fusion of possible felicities and possible mistakes, stop-gaps before the awful advent of a "serious sense of critical responsibility." Or say perhaps rather, to alter the image, that there was only a builded breakwater against the assault of matters demanding a *literal* notation. I walked, at the best, but on the breakwater—looking down, if one would, over the flood of the real, but much more occupied with the sight of the old Cambridge ghosts, who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seemed to advance one by one, even at that precarious eminence, to meet me. My small story would gain infinitely in richness if I were able to name them, but they swarmed all the while too thick, and of but two or three of them alone is it true that they push their way, of themselves, through any silence. It was thus at any rate a question—as I have indeed already sufficiently shown—of what one read *into* anything, not of what one read out of it; and the occasions that operated for that mild magic resolve themselves now into three or four of an intrinsic color so dim as to be otherwise well-nigh indistinguishable. Why, if one could tell it, would it be so wonderful, for instance, to have stood on the low cliff that hangs over the Charles, by the nearer side of Mount Auburn, and felt the whole place bristle with merciless memories? It was late in the autumn and in the day—almost evening; with a wintry pink light in the west, the special shade, fading into a heartless prettiness of gray, that shows with a polar chill through the grim tracery of November. Just opposite, at a distance, beyond the river and its meadows, the white face of the great empty Stadium stared at me, as blank as a rising moon—with Soldiers' Field squaring itself like some flat memorial slab that waits to be inscribed. I had seen it inscribed a week or two before in the fantastic lettering of a great intercollegiate game of football, and that impression had been so documentary, as to the capacity of the American public for momentary gregarious emphasis, that I regret having to omit here all the reflections it prompted.

They were not, however, what was now relevant, save in so far as the many-mouthed uproar they recalled was a voice in the more multitudinous modern hum, amid which one listened almost in vain for the sound of the old names. One of these in particular, rose to my lips—it was impossible to stand there and not reach out a hand to J. R. L. as to a responsive personal presence, the very genius of the spot and who, from early, had given it the direct literary consecration without which even the most charming seats of civilization go through life awkwardly and ruefully, after the manner of unchristened children. They lack thus, for the great occasions, the great formal necessities, their "papers." It was thanks to Lowell, even more immediately than to Longfellow, that Cambridge *had* its papers—though if I find myself putting that word into the past tense it is perhaps be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause of the irresistible admonition, too (proceeding so from a thousand local symptoms), that titles embodied in literary form are less and less likely, in the Harvard air, to be asked for. That is clearly not the way the wind sets: we see the great university sit and look very hard, at blue horizons of possibility, across the high table-land of her future; but the light of literary desire is not perceptibly in her eye (nothing is more striking than the recent drop in her of any outward sign of literary curiosity); precisely for which reason it was, doubtless, in part, that the changed world seemed reflected with a certain tragic intensity even in faces ever so turned to cheerful lights as those of my two constructive companions.

I had passed high, square, sad old Elmwood on the way to my cliff over the Charles, and had wonderingly lingered a little about it. I had passed Mr. Longfellow's immemorial, historical, admired residence, still ample and symmetrical and visibly tourist-haunted (the only detected ruffle of its noble calm); elements of the picture that had rekindled for an hour the finer sensibility, the finer continuity and piety. It was because of these things, again, that I felt the invoked pair beside me presently turn away, as under a chill, from that too spectral (in its own turn) stare of the Stadium—perceived as a portent of the more *roaring,* more reported and excursionized scene; and in particular seemed to see J. R. L.'s robust humor yield to the recognition of the irony of fate, dear to every poet, in one of its most pointed forms. That humor had played of old, charmingly, over the thesis that Cambridge, Mass., was, taken altogether, the most inwardly civilized, most intimately humane, among the haunts of men; whereby it had committed itself, this honest adventurer, to a patient joy in the development of the *genius loci,* and was therefore without provision, either of poetry or of prose, against the picture of proportions and relations overwhelmingly readjusted. If the little old place, with its accessible ear, had been so brave, what was the matter with the big new one, going in, as it would itself say, for greater braveries still? Nothing, no doubt, but that the possession of an ear would be ceasing to count as an advantage. In what produced form, for instance, if he had been right, was now represented the love of letters of which he had been so distinguished an example? If he had on the other hand *not* been right—well, it would all be rather

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dreadful. Such, at all events, may be the adventures of a revisiting spirit—when he has happened to revisit too ingenious an old friend.

The old friend, moreover, had meanwhile had, and in relation to this large loose fringe of the town, there so freely disposed, one of his personal disconcertments; he had turned his steps, for the pleasure of memory, to Fresh Pond, dear to the muses of youth, the Sunday afternoons of spring, and had to accept there his clearest vision perhaps of the new differences and indifferences. The little nestling lake of other days had ceased to nestle; there was practically no Fresh Pond any more, and I seemed somehow to see why the muses had fled even as from the place at large. The light flutter of their robes had surrounded far-away walks and talks: one could at this day, on printed, on almost faded pages, give chapter and verse, for the effect, audible on the Sunday afternoons, of their habit of murmurous hinted approval. Other things had come, by makeweight: the charming Country Club on toward Watertown, all verandahs and golf-links and tennis lawns, all tea and ices and self-consciousness; and there had come, thereabouts, too, the large extension of the "Park System," the admirable commissioners' roads that reach across the ruder countryside like the arms of carnivorous giants stretching over a tea-table of blackberries and buns. But these things were in the eternal American note, the note of the gregarious, the concentric, and pervaded moreover by the rustle of petticoats too distinguishable from any garment-hem of the sacred nine. The desecrated, the destroyed resort had favored, save on rare feast days, the single stroll, or at the worst the double, dedicated to shared literary secrets; which was why I almost angrily missed, among the ruins, what I had mainly gone back to recover—some echo of the dreams of youth, the titles of tales, the communities of friendship, the sympathies and patience, in fine, of dear W. D. H.

HENRY JAMES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUEZ AND PANAMA.

BY FREDERIC COURTLAND PENFIELD, AUTHOR OF "PRESENT-DAY EGYPT."

STUDENTS of canal affairs may agree that it is a misfortune for a nation to possess a site for a waterway connecting oceans and demanded by the necessities of commerce. The cases of Suez and Panama are not dissimilar; the former caused the administration of Egypt to pass to an alien race, while the latter resulted in the loss to a sovereign people of the isthmian route and enough territory with it to form a newcomer among nations.

The history of the Suez Canal is as replete with incident of intrigue and disappointment, and the blighting of human vanity, as any book of fiction; and no Lorelei ever lured more souls to destruction than the sand waste between Port Saïd and Suez.

The canalization of the Suez isthmus as a project antedated the Bible, probably harked back to the beginning of things. Six centuries before the Christian era, Necho, the legend runs, was so impressed by the prophecy of his favorite oracle—that if he persisted in his ambition to unite the Red Sea with the Mediterranean, Egypt would become involved in foreign entanglements and then be lost to the Egyptians—that he heeded the prophecy. In the nineteenth century of our Lord the hoary warning had a considerable measure of fulfilment, certainly; for the construction of the canal brought about indirectly the administration of the Nile country by Great Britain, and surrender of control of the national cash-box to Britain and five other European governments. The irony of these facts is heightened when it is recalled that the country through which the waterway runs owns or controls not one share in the Suez company, nor derives a tittle of benefit from its enormous earnings.

The consummation of the Suez scheme elevated a French diplo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matist into the fickle gaze of the world, as reward for accomplishing what rulers of Egypt, from Seti, father of Rameses the Great, to Napoleon, had sought to do. De Lesseps's triumph cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of human beings, goaded by the lash to dig the great trench; and caused Khedive Ismaïl, throbbing with desire to be a factor in the world, to be driven into life exile as penalty for mortgaging almost the souls of his subjects to secure money for the alluring project. And the superlative mockery of fate is that this canal, benefiting Egypt in no manner, is to-day controlled by England, which obstinately resisted its construction. Ismaïl died disgraced in banishment, as punishment for running amuck with the money-lenders; and Ferdinand de Lesseps, who had been the Great Frenchman, was saved from the fate of a financial charlatan through being bereft of intellect in the closing years of his life.

Prior to giving the canal concession in 1856, Egypt had no debt whatever, and her credit was first pledged to enable the Khedive to subscribe $17,000,000 to the enterprise, although it was stipulated in the concession that the affair was to cost Egypt nothing, and that for ninety-nine years the country was to receive fifteen per cent. of its gross revenue. There were investors in the scheme, of course; but it seemed as if Egypt was ever feeding the insatiable monster with money, as well as with human life. Usurers of Europe had fat pickings through easy-going Ismaïl, who, when he saw that his days on the throne were numbered, sold his personal shares in the canal to the English government for $20,000,000, on which the Egyptian treasury was mulcted for five-per-cent. interest for twenty years after their transfer. This purchase proved Beaconsfield's shrewdness, for by an action sensationally prompt he prevented the shares from going to France. To-day they are worth four times what was paid for them, and they secure to Britain voting control in canal matters. Egypt's fifteen-per-cent. interest in the tolls was marketed to secure a few millions with which to complete the canal. Had Ismaïl not burdened his country with debts, there would have been no Arabi rebellion, and no British "occupation" of the Land of the Nile, it is safe to say.

The Suez waterway is a fraction under a hundred miles in length, and cost approximately $100,000,000. The difficulties encountered in its building were not those to be dealt with by engi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neering skill; and De Lesseps was ever face to face with financial and political obstacles that taxed his resources as negotiator and diplomatist. The canal was in no sense an engineering achievement; the isthmus of sand, washed by seas of identical levels, was pierced by the crudest form of labor, practically unassisted by machinery. Excavators and dredgers of the character employed on the Chicago drainage canal could duplicate the Suez cutting for $25,000,000, experts insist. Thirteen years after the Suez concession was granted, the canal was opened to traffic on March 18th, 1869—and, strange augury, the first vessel to pay toll flew the British ensign.

The canal destroyed Egypt's considerable railway traffic between Alexandria and Suez, besides bringing to the land the foreign domination foreshadowed by the oracle of King Necho's period. Of the never-ending flow of humanity using the canal, few, probably, think of or know the pathetic chapters of its history. It has revolutionized shipping methods and avenues of trade, besides driving the sailing ship from the ocean.

The canal's value to commerce is sufficiently proven by the shortening of distances, compared with the old route around the Cape of Good Hope. By the latter the distance between England and Bombay is 10,860 miles, by the canal 4,620 miles; from St. Petersburg to Bombay by the Cape is 11,610 miles, and by the canal 6,770 miles; and from New York to Bombay by the Cape route the distance is 11,520 miles, while by the canal it is 7,920 miles. How rapidly the traffic attracted by economy of distance and time thus effected has developed, the following statistics, taken quinquennially from the Suez company returns, show:

Year.	Steamers.	Tonnage.	Receipts in Francs.
1871	765	761,467	7,595,385
1876	1,457	2,096,771	27,631,455
1881	2,727	4,136,779	47,193,880
1886	3,100	5,767,655	54,771,075
1891	4,206	8,669,020	83,421,500
1896	3,407	8,594,307	79,652,175
1901	3,699	10,823,840	100,386,397

Some readers may be surprised to learn that the current use of the Suez Canal averages only ten ships daily. Ten or twelve years ago, 75 per cent. of the vessels passing the canal were under the British flag; but in recent years there has been a gradual falling off in the number of English ships, due chiefly to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

systematic effort that Germany is making to develop new markets in the Far East and in Australasia. But the British flag still represents two-thirds of the traffic. Next to England, Germany is the principal user; the Dutch flag comes third, while the tricolor of France is fourth in the list. Not for many years have the Stars and Stripes been seen in the canal over a commercial vessel, yet cargoes to or from the United States employ the canal frequently, nearly always in British bottoms. A few war-ships and transports going to or returning from the Philippines, and two or three yachts, usually comprise the annual volume of American representation.

Last year, all vessels passing through the canal were of the mercantile marine, with the exception of 97 men-of-war, 56 military transports, and 9 yachts. The heaviest user of the "universal turnstile" is England's Peninsular & Oriental Company, which last year paid tolls on 213 steamers. The Ocean Steamship Company, plying between England and Australia, was represented by 145 ships, the Hansa Company by 160, the Messageries Maritimes by 155, the North German Lloyd by 95, and the Clan Line of freighters by 129.

The economy in using the canal is effected through saving of time. The present toll is $1 70 on vessel tonnage, and $2 for every passenger, not counting ship's crew. Since electric lights for night-steaming came into use, it requires from fourteen to eighteen consecutive hours to make the passage from entrance to exit. The tariff for a large steamer, like a liner of the Peninsular & Oriental Company, or a troop-ship filled with soldiers, is not infrequently $10,000.

The gross revenue nowadays is slightly in excess of 20 per cent. on the capitalization, and net earnings about 11 per cent., figures indicating remarkable prosperity, and explaining the popularity in which Suez securities are regarded by investors.

The ordinary width of the canal at the water-line is 328 feet, and at the base 72 feet; but where there are deep cuttings, the superficial width narrows to 190 feet. The mean depth from end to end is 26 feet. In places the canal is dredged to a depth of 30 feet, and it is the intention to deepen the canal throughout, to accommodate the increasing size of battle-ships and passenger-steamers. The slope of the canal-banks at the water-line is one inch in five, and there are about twelve miles of masonry at points

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where the sand is loose and easily disturbed. These retaining-walls are being extended every year, and in time they will inclose the canal from one end to the other, being omitted in the Bitter Lakes, of course.

There are more contrasts than resemblances between the Suez and Panama projects, but each is as old as the limits of history admit. The conception of a Central-American canal belongs probably to the intelligent man who, from the jungle-laden rib of the isthmus, first saw the Caribbean and the Pacific. A century before the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on Plymouth Rock, Spanish adventurers were informing Charles V of Spain of the opportunity to merge the waters of sea and ocean in the New World. Intuitively they perceived the importance of such an achievement, although it required the modern geographer to prove that from Colon to Panama by water is eight thousand miles, instead of forty-seven in a line conveniently direct. In 1550, one Galvao, a Portuguese navigator, wrote a book to prove the feasibility of an artificial connection between the Atlantic and the Pacific; and in 1780 a scientific commission from Spain studied the three Central-American routes—Panama, San Blas and Nicaragua. These are simple facts to be pondered over by busy people, who may possibly be in doubt as to whether the "Father" of the isthmian enterprise was De Lesseps, Senator Morgan or Admiral Walker.

The employment of great canals by commerce must ever depend upon economic considerations.

Already acknowledging our commercial predominance, Europeans are not blind to the real purpose of the Panama Canal. But whenever it is an open choice between the canal toll and the equivalent of time at sea, the Briton will be slow to decide in favor of contributing to the resources of a nation rising in brief time to commercial premiership; and Frenchmen, economists by nature, will take a similar view, as will Germans and shippers of other nations. Expressed in the fewest words, the employment of the Panama route will be governed exclusively by self-interest, computed from the standpoint of material economy.

The Suez route effects a saving in cost of transit between Europe and the Far East equal to 3,000 miles of sea-distance, counting time, fuel, wages and other expenses. Panama tolls cannot consistently be in excess of those of Suez; if identical—$1 70

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per ton—the "limit of economy" should be practically the same, giving ship owner or captain the choice between the cost of canal transit and 3,000 miles of sea travel.

Suez will always be favored by European shipmasters determining routes for cargoes in which Panama and Suez present advantages practically equal; probably the expense of a few hundred miles additional travel would not cause them to break from the old route, on which there is no risk of accident or delay from canal locks. A considerable percentage of the over-sea-carrying trade controlled by British bottoms is geographically independent of canals, and will always be. For example, the bulk of traffic to and from the west coast of South America—the rich nitrate trade of Iquique and Valparaiso—will not ordinarily be altered by the Panama Canal. The economy of distance from the latter port to England and the Continent by the canal being only about 1,500 miles, this traffic, except under unusual circumstances, will continue, as long as it goes in British vessels, to round the extremity of South America; while, as the canal will shorten the distance between the nitrate fields contiguous to Iquique and their customers in Europe only a trifle over the 3,000-mile "limit of economy," much benefit cannot be expected from that source.

The table, printed on the opposite page, condensed from several comparative statements prepared by the Government, shows at a glance the saving in nautical miles to be made possible by the Panama Canal between leading Atlantic and Pacific ports.

By way of Panama, the water distance between New York and San Francisco is to be shortened 8,000 miles, and practically the same to Yokohama, Shanghai, the Philippines and Hawaii. New Orleans will benefit even in greater measure. Better still, every town on the Mississippi River from St. Louis to New Orleans will be endowed by the canal with advantages exceeding those of seacoast towns and cities. A generation hence the movement of traffic down the Mississippi, on the way to the isthmus, is certain to be enormous.

Singapore will be the Asiatic port differentiating the attracting power of the Panama and Suez canals, speaking from the basis of Atlantic and Gulf ports as points of origin or destination. Cargoes for places beyond the 105th degree of east longitude will logically be sent through the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal. But the area east of the Singapore degree of longitude is teeming

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ECONOMY IN SEA MILES BETWEEN ATLANTIC PORTS AND PACIFIC PORTS *VIA* PANAMA CANAL OVER PRESENT ROUTES.

From	To either San Francisco or Port Townsend.	To Guayaquil	To Callao.	To Iquique.	To Valparaiso.	To Yokohama, *via* San Francisco.	To Shanghai, *via* San Francisco and Yokohama.	To Manila, *via* San Francisco and Yokohama.	To Sydney, *via* Tahiti	To Melbourne, *via* Tahiti and Sydney.	To Wellington, *via* Tahiti.
New York.....	7,945	7,559	6,353	5,200	3,831	7,945	8,025	7,945	4,708	4,708	4,708
Norfolk.....	8,073	7,687	6,471	5,328	3,937	8,072	8,152	8,072	4,636	5,203	4,836
Charleston.....	8,281	7,895	6,679	5,518	4,167	8,371	8,478	8,656	5,044	5,064	5,044
Port Tampa.....	8,791	8,425	7,209	6,066	4,697	8,811	8,891	8,811	5,574	5,592	5,574
New Orleans.....	8,942	8,560	7,344	6,201	4,832	8,946	9,026	8,936	5,709	5,709	5,709
Galveston.....	9,027	8,641	7,426	6,283	4,914	9,027	9,107	9,027	5,790	5,790	5,790
Liverpool.....	5,806	5,021	4,204	3,061	1,692	5,806	5,886	5,806	2,569	2,569	2,569
Hamburg.....	5,777	5,391	4,175	3,032	1,463	5,777	5,857	5,777	2,540	2,540	2,540
Antwerp.....	5,791	5,405	4,199	3,046	1,677	5,791	5,871	5,791	2,554	2,554	2,554
Bordeaux.....	5,761	5,365	4,159	3,116	1,647	5,761	5,841	5,761	2,524	2,524	2,584
Gibraltar.....	5,071	4,685	3,488	2,326	957	4,801	5,751	5,072	1,838	3,466	1,834

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with opportunity for Panama cargoes. The isthmian short cut to Oceanica and Asia, comprising the coastal section of China's vast empire (not to be permitted by the Powers to remain dormant), enterprising Japan, the East Indies, Australia, New Zealand, and our own Philippine archipelago, is the world's most potential area. The awakened Orient can use American products to a practically limitless extent. One-third of the trade of these lands would make America great as a world-provider, and could be secured if we embarked seriously in an effort to obtain it. Students of economics have never admitted the logic of America's sending cotton to England, to be there converted into fabric for clothing half the people of the East.

South America's Pacific coast, too remote now for American products and manufactures to have even a foothold, should be wrested from the British and Germans when the canal is completed—for Guayaquil, Callao, Iquique and Valparaiso will then be placed in intimate touch with New York and New Orleans: they are remoter without the canal than antipodean ports. The natural market for South America's west coast, when the canal is in operation, will be the United States; and its banking should be done through New York rather than London and Hamburg. Skeptics will say that the nitrates of Chile and Peru are not required in the States, that perforce they must go to Europe. In a way this is true; but an innovation is possible by which vessels under the Stars and Stripes may capture the west-coast traffic from competing flags and hold it in permanent control.

Let the reader, content in the belief that our manufactures have an extensive use in the outer world, investigate the subject, and his reward will be to learn that *we export only a trifle more than three per cent. of what we manufacture.* Let him, also, study the statistics of our commerce with South America, natural products and manufactures of every sort—they are replete with astonishing facts. To discover that our exports to the southern continent do not exceed one dollar *per capita* of South America's population, will surprise the investigator, doubtless; and that the volume of trade has been practically stationary for years will likewise be disconcerting. South America has 40,000,000 people; but Mexico's 13,500,000 inhabitants buy more from Uncle Sam than the South Americans. We now sell Canadians annually products averaging $24 *per capita.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The reason for the startling disparity in the statistics of trade intercourse with our adjoining neighbors, Canada and Mexico, and oversea South America, is, obviously, the lack of transportation facilities under the American flag; and the adage that "trade follows the flag" has earned more significance than attaches to a mere figure of speech. We pay South America yearly about $120,000,000 for coffee, wool, hides and other raw products; and the major share of this money is expended in Europe for necessities and luxuries of life.

If the Chamberlain preferential tariff programme wins in England, the product of Manitoba's wheat-fields can be landed in the British Isles for twelve cents a bushel less than grain grown in the States—incentive enough, Mr. James J. Hill assures us, to cause Manitoba ten years hence to produce all the wheat that Britain would have to import. If this comes to pass, Uncle Sam must look to the Orient for a customer. China, already a considerable user of our wheat and flour, when American trade in the East is under fair headway, will consume twice as much of the products of our land as go now to Great Britain. Mr. Hill's Great Northern railway prepared for Asiatic trade by constructing in a Connecticut shipyard the two largest freighters in existence. The substitution of an Oriental for a European country, as a grain customer, cannot be helpful to Panama, for our shipments would be from Pacific ports, and Manitoba's product would seek a Canadian Atlantic port.

Mr. Thompson, United States Minister to Brazil, reports that country as being so desirous of American trade that its government voluntarily makes tariff reductions on flour and several other articles without reciprocal concessions on our part. We now send $500,000 worth of flour annually to Brazil; five years ago, her flour bill with Uncle Sam was $1,800,000. Minister Thompson, discussing the preference of Brazil for American products and manufactures, says:

> **"I feel that if the merchants of my country take advantage of the improved tariff conditions in Brazil our trade there should jump in a few years to $30,000,000. . . . I hate to see merchants of other countries grabbing what our countrymen can have if they reach out for it."**

This entertaining expression of opinion may not be germane to canal topics, save that Brazil cannot be different in its attitude

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to United States trade from other Spanish-American countries. Britain has long enjoyed the bulk of the business with the southern continent, as the reward of systematically exploiting the field years ago; but the German trader, selling German goods, delivered in German ships, is gradually elbowing John Bull out, and means to have the business of South and Central America.

The kernel of Minister Thompson's observation on American trade possibilities in Brazil is summed up in the words: "Reach out for it."

How this "reaching out" is to be accomplished, making its effect reasonably permanent, calls for brief consideration only. It should be a movement led or openly supported by the Government, it should be thorough, and it should be conducted on lines of equity and logic. No mercantile body, however zealous, can prosecute the work with reasonable chance of success. A dozen propagandas, aimed at trade extension throughout South America and Caribbean countries and islands, have been tried by American commercial bodies; but, lacking the cooperation of the Government, all failed in their purpose. Editorial campaigns of trade journals have been helpful for a time. Every nation in Europe whose foreign trade is worth considering exploits foreign countries in the thorough manner of a great commercial house—getting business by the most productive, not the easiest, methods. With several governments, the commercial *attaché* of legation or embassy is quite as important as the officer detailed by army or navy. Little good comes of circularizing legations and consulates with advertisements printed, perhaps, in dual languages. Secretary-of-State Blaine appreciated the importance to this country of Latin-American trade; but his plan for securing this was never fully made public. Probably reciprocal tariffs represented the academic side only of his programme. The new Department of Commerce, cooperating with the Department of State, and having the active assistance of our diplomatic and consular officers in South and Central America, might take the matter in hand with practically certain chances of success.

In previous contributions to the REVIEW, I have insisted that the isthmian canal, "destined to make the United States the trade arbiter of the world," could never be expected to "pay" directly. The artificial waterway is to cost a vast deal of money; with the payments to the French company and to the republic of Panama,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

added to the sum necessary to the completion of the work, Uncle Sam's expenditure cannot be less than $225,000,000! It will probably be more. A private incorporation embarked in the enterprise would hold that the investment was entitled to five-per-cent. interest, say, and in time be funded. The money of the nation, embarked in a project distinctly commercial, merits a reasonable rate of income or benefit—four per cent., certainly. To operate the canal, with the expensive up-keep essential to a region of torrential rains, cannot be less than $4,000,000 annually; if the Chagres River refuses to be confined in bounds, the cost will be greater. The items of yearly expense figured here total $13,000,000—a sum to be regarded as the very minimum of the cost of maintaining and operating the canal.

Optimistic students of ocean-transportation statistics say the canal will draw 10,000,000 tons of shipping a year; others, conservative of opinion, say half this volume. Taking the mean of these estimates, I hazard the statement that, six years after the canal is opened, the tonnage will be 7,500,000. The Suez Canal was operated more than thirty years before its business aggregated 10,000,000 tons; and, to produce this volume, several reductions in tolls were necessary. The American Government cannot properly levy a heavier tribute at Panama than is demanded at Suez, for the fact is our canal will not be as essential as that uniting Europe and the East. A like tariff would produce for Uncle Sam, on the hypothesis of a business of 7,500,000 tons, only $12,750,000 a year; a higher tariff would probably produce less. And here is an unpalatable truth—Panama's earnings from passengers can never be considerable, compared with that constantly ebbing and flowing of humanity, between the home countries of Europe and their dependencies in Asia, Africa and Australasia. The *direct* increment of the canal cannot for many years yield what in a commercial enterprise could be called a "profit."

The way to compel the canal to pay *indirectly* is to make it incidental to the development of a mighty commercial marine, that will carry American products to present foreign markets, and to new markets, under the Stars and Stripes. With operations under way on the isthmus, is not the time propitious for popular discussion throughout the nation, and in official Washington, how best to *create* the commerce that will make the Panama Canal a success from its opening?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have populated the country, developed resources of field, forest and mine, and devised matchless ways of translating natural products into finished articles appealing to all mankind. Now, let us cease sending these products of soil and workshop to market in British ships; let us forward them in vessels constructed in American shipyards, thereby making the transaction independently American. Already have we produced ocean carriers equal to the best; while American war-ships, native from keel to topmast truck, are the envy of the world. The perfecting of the turbine engine may mark a new era in shipbuilding, and mercantile craft dependent on older systems of machinery may in a few years be unable to compete with the new order of things.

In but one department of national growth is the United States backward—shipping, in its broad and commercial acceptance. To promote it should now be the plan of both political parties.

Our canal can never pay until we enter as shipowners into competition with Europe's trading nations, and these possess a material interest in the Suez undertaking. The commercial fleet at present under the American flag could not pay a tenth of Panama's operating expenses. When we seriously embark upon the work of creating a great merchant marine, we are going to rouse spirited opposition. Englishmen, Germans and Frenchmen will not like it; Europeans cannot be expected to take any interest in the welfare of our national canal, and all may object to fattening the treasury of a country that is their trade competitor. These facts, insignificant as they may seem, prove in reality the need for supplying hundreds of ocean carriers under the same flag as that flying over the canal zone.

By the time the canal is opened, the United States will have 100,000,000 inhabitants; and agriculture, assisted by ordinary methods and by irrigation, will have developed to an extent that will make our commodities dictators of supply and price. By that time, sea transportation cannot be regarded as a competitor of transcontinental railway systems that have done much towards making the country what it is: water transportation will be found a necessary adjunct to rail facilities, relieving the roads of some of their through traffic, claimed even now to be unprofitable.

FREDERIC COURTLAND PENFIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STENDHAL—A STUDY.

BY COUNT LÜTZOW, PH.D.

MR. GEORGE MOORE has enriched the English language by his discovery of the "Balzacians." "All interesting men," he writes, "are Balzacians. The moment a man is an admirer of Balzac, a sort of freemasonry is established between us." The admirers of Stendhal, fewer in number, but perhaps men of deeper thought, also, I think, deserve a special designation. The name of "Stendhalians" should be applied to the "happy few" to whom Stendhal, foreseeing that he would never achieve general popularity, sometimes dedicated his works.

It is not difficult to account for the limited popularity of Stendhal. Optimism is either innate in humanity, or has become so as a result of the education of countless generations on what may be called optimist lines. There is, therefore, something in Stendhal's works that must appear antipathetic to many. Stendhal is always enlarging on the spiteful and cruel tricks which fate, in a fanciful fashion, plays on humanity. Paul Bourget has noted, in one of those clever studies which he wrote before he had found the way to Damascus, that Beyle prophesied that he would be read about the year 1880, and that that prophecy had proved true. A reaction has taken place since Bourget wrote the "*Etudes de Psychologie Contemporaine*" in 1885. The latest French writers on the subject of Stendhal—a subject that will always be discussed afresh—have judged him somewhat unfavorably. To disparage Stendhal, it has been stated that he was not of his own time, that he belonged to the eighteenth century, and that his views and manner of writing reminded the reader of Rétif de la Bretonne and Laclos. These arbitrary classifications have little value, and it could be affirmed with equal truth that Stendhal was in some matters in advance of his time, and occa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sionally almost prophetic. Thus Stendhal has in Julien Sorel created the type of the modern *révolté*—one could almost say "anarchist." Dostoyevsky's Rozkolnikov and the hero of Bourget's "*Le Disciple*" are direct descendants of Julien Sorel.

One of the most recent French writers on Stendhal has accused him of being rather "an explorer of the middle and lower classes than an observer of the human heart." This view appears to me incorrect. Stendhal's great endeavor was to explore the byways of psychology; such studies are least feasible in an environment in which conventionality has almost effaced individuality. It should be stated, however, that, both in the "*Chartreuse de Parme*" and in "*Le Rouge et le Noir*," we meet with counts, marquises, dukes —and even reigning princes.

If we wish to attempt to fathom Stendhal's enigmatical nature, it is necessary to acquire some knowledge of the events of his life. This is not an easy task, for though Beyle was very fond of writing of himself, he had a mischievous desire of concealing his identity; thence the numerous strange pseudonyms which he adopted.

Stendhal, or rather Henry Beyle, was born at Grenoble in 1783. His youth was unhappy; and, undoubtedly, early recollections largely contributed to produce the bitterness and the hatred for all generally accepted institutions, which marked Beyle throughout his life. Beyle's father seems from the first to have disliked his eccentric son. We constantly find the echo of these family discords in Stendhal's works. Though the older Beyle was a rich lawyer, he seems to have kept his son in a state of financial dependence. As late as 1803 Stendhal writes in his diary:

"In spite of the distress in which my cruel* father leaves me, I am none the less contented. Mr. J. J. called on me to claim the 25 francs which I owe him, and cannot repay, having but the three francs that Crozet lent me."

The early reminiscences of an unhappy home mark a man's life to a greater extent than is generally imagined. The detestable fathers of Julien Sorel in the "*Le Rouge et le Noir*" and of the imaginary traveller in "*Les Mémoires d'un Touriste*" are reminiscences of the youth of their creator. It is also certain that Stendhal was not of a conciliatory nature in his dealings with his family. Thus we are told that, when the news of the

* I have softened down the epithet employed by Stendhal.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

execution of Louis XVI reached Grenoble, young Beyle rejoiced, while his family, who were royalists, wept bitterly.

In the French revolution and the wars that followed it Stendhal, like so many others, found an opening, a way to escape, from the dulness and depression of home life. The Beyles were related to the Daru family, one of whose members became a Count during the Empire. Though Count Daru does not appear to have approved of his eccentric relation and Stendhal himself generally writes rather ill-naturedly of the Darus, it was through their influence that he obtained employment in the French army in Italy. Then only seventeen years old, he crossed the St. Bernard two days after Napoleon, and was first under fire at the Fort du Bard and—suspicious as he always was—he appears to have feared that his extreme youth might cause his comrades to doubt his courage. He, therefore, displayed the most reckless bravery; no doubt he also hoped that danger would give him one of the new sensations which he always craved. He was disappointed, and in the evening asked himself, "*N'est ce que cela?*" As Mr. Rod has truly stated, these words, "*N'est ce que cela,*" were to Stendhal always the melancholy refrain, the "*Leit-motif,*" of his varied experiences.

Shortly after the skirmish at the Fort du Bard, Stendhal arrived at Milan. During his first stay at the capital of Lombardy, he appears already to have acquired that passionate love for Milan which never left him, and which is commemorated on his tombstone. Love and war were then his only ideals, and to a great extent remained so. Their world-old association constantly meets us in Stendhal. Alluding to this aspect of the great writer, Mr. Maurice Hewlett has strikingly written of Julien Sorel—Stendhal's greatest figure—that he was "a little Napoleon, whose Austerlitz was Mademoiselle de la Môle, and whose Moscow was Madame Rénal." It should, however, be stated in justice to Stendhal that in later life literature, music and painting greatly interested him. Except through hints scattered in Stendhal's own journals, we know little of his first stay at Milan, nor to what extent he himself acted the part of his "Lieutenant Robert" in the "*Chartreuse de Parme.*" He always made it a point of writing obscurely, and in a purposely misleading manner, of his love-affairs; this appears to me to be a proof of good taste, though the contrary view has often been expressed. Though war,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undoubtedly, had a great fascination for Stendhal—he was present at the Battle of Marengo, as well as at the skirmish of the Fort du Bard—his independent nature and his dislike of discipline and authority prevented his regularly pursuing a military career.

It is very difficult to gather a clear account of Stendhal's life from the books that have been written about him, and perhaps his own "*Journal*," "*Souvenir d'Egotisme*" and "*Mémoires d'un Touriste*" are our best authority. There is no doubt that, during the first years after leaving the army, he led what it is usual to call a Bohemian life. On his return to Paris, he formed part of a certainly entertaining, though probably somewhat disreputable, little society, which mainly consisted of actors and actresses and civil and military employees of Napoleon's government. The centre of this little group was—at least according to Stendhal's view,—the actress Mélanie Guibert, whom with his usual mania for mystification he calls "Louason."

The part of Stendhal's journal that belongs to this point, which Mr. Kazimir Stryenski has, with marvellous accuracy, transcribed from the original manuscript at Grenoble, is of the deepest interest and throws what may be called a search-light on the mind of Beyle. The manner in which youthful hopefulness and the idealization so natural to a very young man alternate with the jealousy and distrustfulness which were natural to Stendhal, and had been yet increased by the incidents of an unhappy childhood, is very interesting. The annals of this "vicious idyll," as it has been happily called, are well worth reading in Stendhal's journal; very characteristic is the general maxim which he based on this, his first serious, experience of love. He writes: "The worst of all mistakes to which the knowledge of womanhood leads us is never to love for fear of being dupes." In spite of these wise reflections, Stendhal appears to have felt a true passion for Mélanie; and, when her theatrical duties called her to Marseilles, he followed her there. On hearing of this, old Beyle stopped supplies, and his son was for a short time obliged to earn a precarious living by acting as an assistant in a shop. Stendhal has suppressed this incident in his generally very outspoken journal.

Fortunately for Stendhal, and unfortunately for his fortunate rival, the "divine Mélanie" entirely gave up the young and impecunious Beyle shortly after their visit to Marseilles, to follow a Russian who eventually married her. Stendhal does not appear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to have regretted her as much as his former ecstatic adoration of Louason would lead one to expect.

Through Count Daru, he obtained an appointment in the commissariat of the *grande armée*. He seems to have acquitted himself successfully in discharging his new duties, and to have even won the approval of Napoleon himself by raising by a million the contribution which the town of Brunswick was ordered to pay into the French army chest during the Prussian campaign of 1806. Unfortunately, the part of Stendhal's journal that dealt with this campaign has been lost; but we have his interesting account of the next of Napoleon's innumerable wars, the campaign against Austria in 1809. The twenty-sixth part of the journal contains a description of the invasion of Austria in that year. As a proof of Stendhal's extreme cautiousness, it is interesting to quote the strange note that he has prefixed to this part of his diary. He writes:

"For prudence' sake I will write nothing, firstly, of the events; secondly, of our political relations to Germany, and particularly to Prussia, which is stupid enough not to attack us; thirdly, of Dom's* relations to the greatest of men.†

"This a journal which only *purposes* to observe myself and has no interest for others. For the sake of prudence, nothing about politics; all the names to be changed. I notice only the observations about myself."‡

The twenty-sixth part of the diary, to which Stendhal, whose perverse love for writing bad English never forsook him, has given the undertitle, "The Life and Sentiments of Silencious [*sic*] Harry,"§ treats of the writer's stay in Vienna after that town had been occupied by the French. These reminiscences of warfare are sometimes very vivid. Thus he writes from Enns:

"While walking up and down, I continued to admire the situation of Lombach. I said to myself: 'This is the most interesting sight I have ever viewed in my life.' Seeing some guns that were pointed at the monastery, I said to Lacombe: 'Nothing is wanting here except a fire and an attack of the enemy.'"

* One of Stendhal's many pseudonyms. At that time he sometimes assumed the name of "Dominico Vismara."
† Napoleon.
‡ The last two words are in English in the original.
§ Thus written in English by Stendhal.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stendhal's wish was destined to be promptly gratified. Only a few lines later he writes:

"We went home and slept on chairs in the commander's house; we then supped and again fell asleep. At two o'clock, there is some talk of starting. I notice a strong light behind one of the houses. I say to myself: 'This is a very bright bivouac.' The light and the smoke increase. It is obvious that there is a fire. I watch the confusion caused by the fire in all its gradations—first, the tranquillity of sleep, and, at last, the clatter of the hoofs of the transport horses, which were galloping to the meeting-place from all directions."

Stendhal writes somewhat later:

"On arriving at the bridge at Ebersberg, we find corpses of men and horses; thirty were still on the bridge. It had been necessary to throw a great many into the river, which is very wide here; in the middle of the river, four hundred feet under the bridge, a horse stood upright and quite immovable—a singular effect."

It will be seen that Stendhal, like Tolstoy, who has expressed great admiration for his great predecessor, gathered on the battlefield the materials for his incomparable battlepieces.

Stendhal's last experience of war was during the Russian campaign of 1812. The part of his journal which described this campaign and the retreat from Moscow has, unfortunately, been lost. He appears here also to have practised that indifference to his surroundings and that constant introspection which—originally, probably, an affectation—had become second nature to him. In a passage of "*L'Amour*" he wrote thus of one of the characters—who, as usual, is largely modelled on the author:

"He let the day of the fall of Napoleon, which meant ruin, pass by without frowning. Then, as in Russia, he was surprised not to feel anything; he had indeed never been sufficiently afraid of anything in life to think about it for two days."

The fall of Napoleon, indeed, meant ruin for Stendhal. Though the government of the Bourbons—whom he detested—offered him employment, he decided to retire entirely from political life and seek refuge in his beloved Milan. His devotion to the fallen Emperor, to whom he dedicated his "*Histoire de la Peinture en Italie*," should be noted, as Stendhal has often been accused of selfishness and heartlessness.

It was in the sympathetic atmosphere of Milan that he first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeared as an author. The interest in literature, art and music that had always been dormant within him now awoke.

It is impossible to write of Stendhal without referring to his love-affairs, both successful and unsuccessful. At Milan, a renewed feeling of affection for Signora P——, whom he had known when he was almost a boy during his first stay at Milan, entirely absorbed him. Though the name is well known in Italy, it is, perhaps, even after the lapse of a century, well to imitate Stendhal's discretion. It is sufficient to say that the lady was the original of the Contessa Pietranera in the "*Chartreuse de Parme.*" The first book that Stendhal published was a life of Haydn. "*Rome, Naples et Florence,*" "*L'Amour*" and the "*Histoire de la Peinture en Italie*" rapidly followed. Of these three books, the two first-named are little more than continuations of his journal, which he now ceased to keep.

If it was possible for Stendhal to be happy, he was so when staying at Milan—a town whose charm he never could forget. His autobiographic writings—and most of his books are to a greater or lesser degree autobiographic—at this time constantly insist on the contrast between the stiffness, conventionality and insincerity of French life, and the freedom, individualism and artistic feeling of Milan. There is, no doubt, much truth in this; but it is easy to perceive that Stendhal, to a great extent, attributed to local circumstances that feeling of relief that all experience who have held official positions and suddenly find themselves "gentlemen at large."

At any rate, nobody will quarrel with Stendhal for preferring the company of the poets and singers whom he met at Milan to that of the Napoleonic officials, whose brutality and dishonesty he has so graphically described. Very interesting is his account of his meeting with Byron at the Scala Theatre. He writes:

"One evening we saw at the Scala a young man enter the box (of Monsignor Louis de Brême), who was rather short, and had magnificent eyes. When he stepped to the front of the box, we noticed that he limped slightly. Monsignor de Brême said to us: 'Gentlemen! Lord Byron.' He then named us to his Lordship. This was done with as much ceremony as the grandfather of Monsignor de Brême, who was ambassador of Savoy at the court of Louis XIV, would have shown."

Stendhal, who apparently considered Lord Byron responsible to some extent for the then recent deportation of Napoleon to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

St. Helena, at first treated the poet with great reserve. He writes: "My determination to remain on very cold terms no doubt accounts for the fact that, after a few days, Lord Byron showed me proofs of great kindness." After describing a conversation, at the Scala, on the British policy, he continues:

"All those who were present in the box thought that, after this discussion, which had been very sharp, though I had behaved in a very civil and even respectful manner, Lord Byron would never speak to me again. But, on the following day, he took my arm, and walked with me through the enormous, solitary passages of the Scala. I was charmed by his kindness, but I was mistaken.* Lord Byron wished to ask a hundred questions of one who had been an eye-witness of the Russian campaign. He wanted to reach the truth by trying to put me out of countenance; in fact, I underwent a cross-examination.† I did not then notice it. That night I read 'Childe Harold' with wild delight. I loved Lord Byron."

It would be very tempting to linger over Stendhal's Italian impressions, but want of space prevents my doing so; besides, Stendhal will always—and rightly—be known mainly as the author of *"Le Rouge et le Noir"* and *"La Chartreuse de Parme."* The almost exaggerated caution of Stendhal did not, in the long run, enable him to escape the suspicion of Metternich's police at Milan. He was obliged to leave the Austrian territory and went to Paris, where he remained almost continuously up to the year 1830, which brought another great change in his career. Though he produced other works at this time, it is the famous *"Le Rouge et le Noir"* that marks this period in the life of Beyle. The impress of the clerical-Bourbon rule, which Stendhal hated, is traceable in every line of the book.

Few novels, perhaps, have caused so much controversy; few that had but a moderate success when they appeared—though it is a mistake to believe that *"Le Rouge et Le Noir"* was a failure at first—have had so much influence on later generations, have found so many blind admirers. The story itself is very simple, and is told with almost affected simplicity. The hero, Julien Sorel, is the son of "Father Sorel as he is called, now that he is a man of means,"‡ who is the owner of a sawmill.

* The note of true Stendhalian distrust is discernible here.
† The last words are in English in the original.
‡ Here, as in future, I quote the excellent translation of *"Le Rouge et le Noir,"* by E. T. Robins.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Julien, who is ill-treated by his father and brothers, succeeds in obtaining a certain amount of learning, particularly a considerable knowledge of Latin, by means of his friendship with the Abbé Chelan. Enemy of the church of Rome—I had almost written "*mangeur de prêtres*"—though Stendhal was, he has succeeded in giving a striking and sympathetic portrait of this priest. Julien's only other friend and instructor was an old army surgeon, who had taken part in the Napoleonic wars, which are his only subject of conversation, the "*Bulletins de la Grande Armée*" being his gospel.

Poor and unhappy at home, Julien gladly accepts the suggestion that he should become tutor to the children of M. de Rénal, who is mayor of the imaginary town of Verrières, which Stendhal has created as a *milieu* for his tale. Julien soon attracts the attention of Madame de Rénal, who hitherto "had thought that M. de Rénal was much less tiresome than the other men of her acquaintance," and had "always regarded the passions, as we regard the lottery—an investment from which fools alone expect a fortune." Julien at first is very timid and reproaches himself severely. "I am wanting in resolution," he says; "I should have made a poor soldier to serve under Napoleon." He seeks comfort in reading the Napoleonic bulletins, which his old friend the army surgeon had left him. Inspired by them, he finally declares his love to Madame de Rénal. During this whole "campaign," the question, "*Qu'aurait fait Napoléon?*" constantly occurs to Julien. Similarly, when later in the book he is preparing to scale the window of Mathilde de la Môle's room, he seeks courage by looking at a bust of Richelieu. The chiselled features seemed turned on him sternly, as if reproaching him for the lack of that audacity so natural to the French character. "In your time, great man, should I have hesitated!"

This habit, amounting to mania, of introducing events of history or fiction into the lives of his heroes with which they have no apparent connection is intensely Stendhalian. Such a line of thought is undoubtedly morbid, but it is not so impossible as it seems to some. It is also, perhaps, more frequent among those of later generations, than among Stendhal's contemporaries. It is indeed almost a truism to state that all great works of fiction have to a certain extent moulded the minds of men and women of later generations, particularly when they read them in their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

youth. An example to the point occurs to me. An English friend has told me that, some years ago, his name had—though unjustly—been entangled in a divorce case that was then creating a great sensation. My friend's social position appeared endangered, and he determined to go to Paris for a short time. There, at the Hôtel Régina, near the Louvre, my friend, who is very Stendhalian, almost forgot his troubles while studying the masterpieces of the neighboring gallery. He had not brought many of his books, and therefore depended to a great extent on the scanty library of the hotel. This library contained Thackeray's "Vanity Fair"; and, as so often happens, when one repeatedly reads a work of genius, the book became an obsession to him. One evening, when returning from a walk, he bought an English paper, and the words, "The —— divorce," stared him in the face. Immediate and decisive action was necessary. My friend tells me that that evening Thackeray's words, "The enemy has passed the Sambre, and our left is already engaged; come away; we march in three hours," haunted him.

To return to Julien, it should be mentioned that he left the house of the Rénals shortly after this, his first, love-affair. He first went to Besançon, to continue there his preparations for an ecclesiastical career. Julien's life at the seminary is described with great *finesse,* but we must always remember that we are reading the work of an enemy of the Church of Rome.

"Julien," Stendhal writes, "vainly endeavored to reduce himself mentally and physically to the level of his associates; he could not please; he was too different." Finally, through priestly influence, Julien obtains the position of private secretary to the Marquis de la Môle, a great landowner, who, for some ill-defined political purpose, spends a large part of the year in Paris; for even in fiction Stendhal maintains his appearance of secrecy. Julien soon attracts the attention of Mademoiselle Mathilde de la Môle, the marquis's daughter; she is certainly one of the strangest, though probably not to many one of the most sympathetic, characters in fiction. Mathilde de la Môle is one of the few figures in history or romance who have found what may almost be called passionate lovers. The strange mixture of pedantry, sensuality and half-despair which constitutes her personality is very difficult to analyze, and I do not attempt a task in which great French authors, who have written of Stendhal, have failed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is only possible to outline her character by quoting some of Stendhal's most striking notes concerning Mathilde, who was evidently his favorite heroine. Thus he tells us that "Mathilde's handsome eyes, instinct with the profoundest ennui and, what was still worse, the despair of ever finding pleasure more in life, fell on Julien"; and that she "looked forward to the future, not with terror—that was a more pronounced sentiment than comported with her nature—but with a disgust rare in one so young."

"*Le Rouge et le Noir*" is so well known that it seems superfluous to give a full account of Stendhal's romance. It is agreed that Julien shall marry Mathilde, and the marquis has undertaken to insure his career. At the last moment, everything is overthrown by a clerical intrigue. On the advice of her confessor, Madame de Rénal writes a letter to the Marquis de la Môle, informing him that "Julien is entirely devoid of religious principles, and that it is a settled policy with him to secure a foothold in a family by trying to seduce the woman whose credit there is greatest." A despairing letter of Mathilde reaches Julien at Strasburg, where, through the influence of the Marquis de la Môle, he has obtained an appointment as officer in a cavalry regiment. Julien hurries to Paris, where he has an interview with Mademoiselle de la Môle, who shows him Madame de Rénal's letter. He now starts immediately for Verrières, finds Madame de Rénal in church, and fires two pistol-shots at her, wounding her severely. Julien is arrested, tried, convicted and decapitated.

The end of the book is very Stendhalian. During the time that Julien had been employed as secretary at the Hôtel de la Môle, he had noticed that Mathilde appeared at dinner one day in deep mourning. He questioned one of the guests, who answered: "Is it possible that you are ignorant of what occurred on the Place de la Grève on April 30th, 1574?" Julien is then told that on that day one of Mathilde's ancestors, Boniface de la Môle, the handsomest young man of his day, had been decapitated. He had been the adored lover of Queen Marguerite of Navarre, and had attempted to rescue from prison the Duc d'Alençon and the King of Navarre, afterwards King Henry IV—the husband of his mistress—who had both been imprisoned by order of Catherine de Médici. The attempt failed and Boniface was decapitated. "But what most impressed Mathilde de la Môle," Stendhal writes, "in that political catastrophe was the behavior of Queen Mar-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guerite, who witnessed her lover's death from the window of a house in the Place de la Grève, and sent her women to beg his head from the executioner. The following night, on the stroke of twelve, she took the head in her carriage, and buried it in person in a little chapel at the foot of the Montmartre hill."

Mathilde resolves similarly to honor her own lover after death. She persuades Fouqué to obtain her lover's corpse for her:

"'I wish to see him,' she said. Fouqué had not the courage to speak or to rise. He pointed to an ample blue mantle spread upon the floor. Its folds covered all that remained of Julien.

"She sank to her knees. Doubtless, the remembrance of Boniface de la Môle inspired her with more than human courage. . . . When Fouqué ventured to look in her direction, she had placed Julien's head on a small marble-topped table, and, kneeling before it, was kissing the cold brow. . . . She followed her lover's remains to the tomb."

The year 1830, the year in which "*Le Rouge et le Noir*" appeared, greatly influenced Stendhal's life. The Bourbon rule which he detested came to an end, and the reign of Louis Philippe —welcomed by Stendhal, as by so many others, as the dawn of freedom—began. Stendhal believed that "*la liberté de la presse et les deux chambres*"—his favorite demands—would now be obtained. Stendhal's political views have often puzzled his readers; but his strange combination of blind admiration for Napoleon and intense desire for popular liberty was not as strange in the period between 1815 and 1830 as it would appear now. Besides, Stendhal was, above all, an enemy of the Church of Rome; one who had had the courage to imprison a Pope was sure to secure his sympathy. The new government at last raised Stendhal from his precarious position. He was appointed consul at Cività Vecchia in the Papal States, and remained there with short interruptions up to his death in 1842. In his last years, he tired even of his beloved Italy. "*J'ai trop vu le Soleil,*" he is reported to have said frequently during his last years. Still, some of his best works belong to this his last stay in Italy. Of these the "*Chartreuse de Parme*" is the best known. I must plead guilty to considering it vastly inferior to the "*Rouge et le Noir,*" of which it is to a certain extent a counterpart. It is devoid of the energy—Stendhal's favorite word—of the earlier book. Of the other writings of this period, a series of Italian sketches—afterwards published jointly under the name of "*Chroniques Italiennes*"—de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

serve notice. One of these tales, "*L'Abesse de Castro,*" ranks among Stendhal's finest works. It was first published in 1839 in the "*Revue des Deux Mondes*" under the pseudonym of "F. de Lagenais." It records the loves of the *condottiere* Julien Branciforte and Elena di Campireali. Branciforte is obliged to fly, and enlists as a volunteer in the Spanish army—the scene is placed in the Neapolitan Kingdom. Elena becomes a nun and eventually Abbess of her convent. She believes Julien to have been killed in Mexico, and becomes faithless to his memory. Discovering that he is still alive, she resolves to die; but, before doing so, writes to him one of the most pathetic letters that a woman has ever written to a man. She then visits Ugone, an old friend of Branciforte. She finds him asleep and is thus able to obtain possession of his dagger. She then awakes him and asks him to deliver her letter to his friend. Guessing its contents, he hesitates to do so. "Madam," he says, "have you reflected on what you are doing? The Signor Julio loves you so much." "I, also," she answers, "love him; take the letter and carry it to him yourself." "Well, may God bless you who are so good!" Ugone said to the Abbess. Then, Stendhal says, "Ugone went away and returned very shortly; he found Elena dead; his dagger had pierced her heart."

Nietzsche, perhaps the last of the great German philosophers, has written of Stendhal that, of all Frenchmen of his century, he was the one whose eyes and ears had been richest in thought. Long before I had read these lines I had noticed Stendhal's influence on Nietzsche. There is common to both that admiration for the Italian Renaissance when an "overman"—be it a Pope's son, like Cesare Borgia, or a *condottiere,* a brigand, such as Branciforte—could and did overrule the ordinary laws of humanity. When Count Mosca, in the "*Chartreuse de Parme,*" asks Clelia Conti whether she has "enough wit to despise her father," and when Julien Sorel, on the eve of death, remarks of his father—who embraced him only after he found that he was leaving a little money—"This, then, is paternal love!" we find ourselves in those weird regions which Nietzsche has described as "*Jenseits des Guten und Bösen.*"

A French writer on Stendhal has briefly summed up his career in these words: "He loved much and he wrote much; therefore, much should be forgiven to him." I do not think that I can improve on this verdict.

LUTZOW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SCIENCE AND IMMORTALITY.

BY J. SANDERSON CHRISTISON, M.D.

WE are accustomed to be told that the question of immortality can be satisfactorily settled only by the materialization of a properly accredited ghost. Absurd and impossible as this demand may seem, it now appears that the Society for Psychical Research, a vigorous, learned and modern body, containing many of our ablest psychologists and men eminent in other sciences, on both sides of the Atlantic, is almost ready to vouch for the possibility of such a demonstration. Indeed, in the opinion of some of its most distinguished members, such evidence has been found; while others, not so fully persuaded, freely admit that there are evidences pointing in that direction. And these conclusions follow after long and careful investigations which were entered upon in a spirit of scepticism. Such testimony is surely entitled to respectful consideration, since there is no moral or scientific authority for denying what we cannot disprove.

If, however, our belief in immortality were to depend exclusively upon such evidence coming to us direct—that is to say, by the reappearance of or communication with deceased persons—I fear not all of us would find the required opportunity to become persuaded. Such phenomena are regarded by many as being incredible on the ground that they are exceptional, and not in accordance with the usual order of Nature. But Nature is constantly presenting us with exceptional phenomena which we can neither deny nor explain. What shall we say of the astonishing events of trance, of somnambulism, of telepathy? That they occur is certain. And what shall we say of the organic exceptions to Nature's apparent rules—the so-called paradoxes—which are no less puzzling and are very numerous? There are "sports" among plants; there are five-legged quadrupeds; there are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

albinos among negroes; and among certain animals the isolated females habitually produce perfect offspring.

For the most part, such exceptions as I refer to are known to us only through the testimony of others. Yet who among us has reasons for denying them? And, if an exception in Nature is possible at all, it is possible anywhere and at any time, for it is an exception only because of our inability to explain it by other phenomena. It cannot be regarded as a break in the plan of creation, a plan which we shall later see is declared by science to be absolutely unfathomable. Yet, we are possessed with capacities for increasing our knowledge and understanding, which, in return, increase our capacity for believing what we do not understand. Is it not more than likely that the representative mind of the eighteenth century would have doubted any prophecy declaring that we would listen to the voices of each other a thousand miles apart, or that we would be able to see with our eyes through the hide of an ox? Yet, to-day these things are commonplace. The truth is, that those who have the widest knowledge are the most humble before well-attested exceptions; for, while we know what we expect, nothing is more certain than that we never know that what we expect will happen.

But in so far as Nature is known to us at all, her methods of working are found to be absolutely invariable, and her apparent irregularities seem the more regular the more they are understood. How otherwise could there be that harmony and balance in Nature which is the basis of all confidence and hope? We truly feel that we can trust Nature. But to what extent do we really understand her? Let us hear what science has to say. But, first, let us understand what science is, and then we shall know upon what she is entitled to speak and to what extent; for it is chiefly in the name of science that objections to a belief in immortality have of late years arisen.

Science is defined as classified knowledge. It is more correctly defined as the imperfect classification of imperfect knowledge. Indeed, some of its departments do not appear to be in a very robust or orderly condition. For example, Professor Starr Jordan has recently compared the science of Geology to "a book with half its leaves torn out, and the other half confused, displaced and blotted."* Such a condition would seem to be a good

* "Popular Science Monthly," October, 1902.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

illustration of divine irregularities. But much the same comment can be sustained against other departments of science, while it is quite certain that no department has spoken its last word. Such being the case, it is evident that the deductions of science, commonly called "laws of Nature," are necessarily limited and fragmentary in their range. Furthermore, it is to be noted that they are merely human conceptions; for, as Huxley has said, "a law of Nature is the product of a mental operation upon the facts of Nature which come under our observation, and has no more existence outside of the mind than color has." Thus we see that science at best is simply the product of an orderly method of observation which may be applied to any subject whatever; and its laws are merely condensed statements of observed facts.

However, it must be evident to any one that a distinction must be made between science and scientists, for while the very nature of science is order and precision, scientists are prone to suffer from human infirmities.

It was the keen-minded Huxley who also declared that "science warns us that an opinion which outstrips evidence is not only a blunder but a crime." I think no one can dispute this, if it is only made clear as to what constitutes evidence. It is certain that were we to judge the soundness of science by the variety of theories at present held by scientists in the name of evolution, we would have to pronounce her a very uncertain authority on questions of fundamental importance.

But, as previously observed, science can only give a very limited range of testimony with any degree of certainty, for the reason that its departments are not only imperfect developments in themselves, but that they are specializations in knowledge, which have no authority to speak beyond their own phenomena until they are compared with one another. But, as Nature is a recognized unit, we would require a full knowledge of all the sciences, were they complete, before we could obtain the white light of a universal wisdom which is necessary to the comprehension of the fundamental problems involved in the mechanism of Nature. This requirement is strictly in accordance with the scientific dogma that science stops where evidence stops. Indeed, the solution by science of any fundamental problem of life whatever must necessarily await the conclusion of all possible investigation; whereas, the needs of humanity require that they come at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beginning as guides and illuminators to our very first steps. It would have been a strange condition of affairs if man had been required to wait upon science for that knowledge which is most essential to his welfare. But, even if science had analyzed the whole universe, it could reveal nothing more, as a contribution to our knowledge of personal relationship or duty, than what is knowable without such aid, inasmuch as a complete synthetic product resulting from a final analysis of all things tangible could result in nothing more and nothing less than Nature as she is, with all the phenomena as perceived through our outer and inner senses, unaided by any scientific devices. It is in this view that Nature is most readily seen to be the harmonious expression of both the means and the purpose of all law. The tendency of men of science is to ignore this aspect of Nature, as if the uncertain physiology of a part were the philosophy of the whole. Nevertheless, it is the general phenomena of Nature, into which we are born and among which we grow up, that are best understood and most informative, while the uncertainties with which we find ourselves surrounded constitute the very spice of life, the divine means for the development of faith, hope and charity, which some would seem to regard as the mere effluvia of organic decomposition.

It is surely clear to all that, owing to the imperfect state of science, it is in no position to dogmatize respecting the scheme of Nature, or even upon Nature's possibilities. Furthermore, it appears as a revelation of its own, that, in respect to the solution of any fundamental scheme of Nature, science is utterly helpless and hopeless, inasmuch as the greatest of all her discoveries is the fact that she is doomed to labor forever in the clouds of a universal paradox, wherein the farther she proceeds the more remote seems the end. Professor McKendrick, of Glasgow, has recently reminded us of this fact in regard to Physiology;* while Lord Kelvin has also quite recently told us that, as far as Physics and Chemistry go, these two sciences give no evidences whatever in support of the theory of evolution,† which is practically an announcement that the two most advanced sciences, those which deal with the final analysis of all things appreciable to our senses, absolutely deny the possibility of an

* Presidential Address, Section of Physiology, British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1901; "Nature," September 26, 1901.
† Address reported in "The Times," London, May 4, 1903.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

automatic universe. It is even beginning to appear that the biological sciences are barren on the same question. Dr. Beard, the distinguished lecturer on comparative Embryology, in the University of Edinburgh, made the declaration* before the British Medical Association last summer that "the theory of natural selection (Darwinian theory) explains nothing at all beyond the state of science in certain years of the nineteenth century. . . . Unfortunately," he continued, "the belief in natural selection has become a superstition, and is now the personification of a mysterious deity." Other eminent biologists and philosophers can be quoted to the same effect. That such a theory as the Darwinian has attained so widespread acceptance, is but an illustration that no class of individuals are exempt from thought infection, wherever the mental soil has been rendered susceptible through the incoherence of an overloaded and restless ego. It is usually easier to follow suit than to follow the exactions of logic.

In this connection we must remember that the theory of evolution is not merely a claim respecting an order of events in Nature, but it is also a declaration of their mode of arrival as the grand scheme of the universe. In the light of the scientific axiom that only equals can comprehend equals, such an assumption must seem a monstrosity.

But, for the very reason that Chemistry and Physics do not support the theory of evolution, which attributes the origin of life to purely material things, we find that they give substantial support to a belief in personal immortality by their demonstration of certain principles which are a necessary part of all organic equations. They have demonstrated the principle that all matter is composed of individualities, and that these individualities are absolutely indestructible, although capable of assuming many relations. These individualities, or indivisible particles, may be displaced and recombined into many forms, but they can never be destroyed or deprived of their identity. As Stewart and Tait, the eminent physicists, observed some twenty years ago, "Experiments of the most varied kind consistently show us that we cannot produce or destroy even the smallest quantity of matter." Indeed, the very order and harmony of Nature are dependent upon the specific and unalterable character of its elementary constituents. They are the orderly means for an orderly service

* "British Medical Journal," October 15, 1904, p. 971.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and end. In other words, the physical materials of Nature are composed of immortal entities, as far as human reason and experience can discover. Nothing in Nature is ever lost but *form*, and nothing *of* Nature can be conceived as changing Nature.

But, farther than this, the science of Chemistry points through reason from the finite to the infinite—from a physical to a metaphysical realm beyond all things appreciable by our senses. Says Professor Ira Remsen, of Johns Hopkins, in a recent address:*

"The chemist is brought face to face with facts which lead him to the belief that the smallest particles he can weigh by the aid of the most delicate balance, and the smallest particle he can see by the aid of the most powerful microscope, are immense as compared with those of which he has good reason to believe the various kinds of matter to be made up."

Thus the master chemist concurs with the master physicist, Lord Kelvin, when he says that "we have an unknown object placed before us in science."†

To assume, as some evolutionists seem inclined to do, that the various elements are but different groupings of the particles or atoms of the same substance, is simply to shift the problems of their origin and control to another base without in any way accounting for either.

In passing from the inorganic to the organic world, we must cross an immeasurable gap which all the industry of science has failed to bridge. Herbert Spencer long ago promised a volume that was to reveal the evolution of things living from things without life. But this promise he failed to keep.

But, respecting this gap between the unorganized and organized worlds, Lord Kelvin has stated the case of science in his recent address to the students of St. George's Hospital, London:‡

"Let not youthful minds be dazzled by the imaginings of the daily newspapers that, because Berthelot and others have thus made foodstuffs, they can make living things, or that there is any prospect of a process being found in any laboratory for making a living thing, whether the minutest germ of bacteriology or anything smaller or greater. There is an absolute distinction between crystals and cells. Anything that crystallizes may be made by the chemist. Nothing approaching to the

* Worcester Polytechnic, June 4, 1903; "Science," July, 1903.
† "Nineteenth Century," June, 1903.
‡ "Nature," November 3, 1904.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cell of a living creature has ever yet been made. The general result of an enormous amount of exceedingly intricate and thoroughgoing investigation by Huxley and Hooker and others of the present age, and by some of their predecessors in both the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries, is that no artificial process whatever can make living matter out of dead. This is vastly beyond the subject of the chemical laboratory, vastly beyond my own subject of physics or of electricity—beyond it in depth of scientific and of human interest."

Professor Wilson, of Columbia University, in his work, "The Cell and Heredity," declares that the more the cell is studied, the farther removed it appears from the inorganic world. The cell is an object composed of matter and energy *plus* a *something* which cannot be tested by any test that can be applied to matter or energy; and, therefore, it is a something which is neither matter nor energy. This intangible something—this life-property or organizing power, without which the cell would be nothing but dead matter or a bundle of crystals, cannot be regarded as a product of the matter composing the cell, inasmuch as the matter composing the cells or germs is identical for organisms which are vastly different in their final structures. For example, the germ-cells of a polyp and a fish are substantially alike and may grow side by side in the same drop of water, the one becoming a simple polyp, while the other assumes the complex form of a fish. Thus it is evident that neither the mere substance of the cells, nor anything in their environment, can account for the life-property or organizing power which is manifested by their difference in development. Professor Brooks, of Johns Hopkins University, in speaking of this organizing power of the germ, says:*

"While we know nothing of its origin, there seem to be insuperable objections to the view that this influence is either matter or energy. If it is physical energy, or wave motion, or perigenesis of plastidules, it is hard to understand why it has not all been dissipated long ago, or how it can multiply itself."

Professor McKendrick observes that:†

"*If the matter were considered fully, it becomes evident that the* phenomena of life depend on changes occurring in the interaction of particles of matter far too small even to be seen by the strongest magnification yet obtained by microscopes."

* "Foundations of Zoology," p. 281.
† "Nature," September 26, 1901.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Professor Clerk Maxwell, in the "Encyclopedia Britannica," presented three propositions respecting the nature of the germ-cell, namely, first, the germ cannot be structureless, otherwise it could not develop into a future being with its thousands of characteristics; second, if it is structural, it is too small to contain a sufficient number of molecules to account for all the characteristics that are transmitted; or, thirdly, that the germ-cell is not a purely material system. It is evident that the first two propositions entirely destroy each other, so that the third or last proposition, namely, that the germ is not a purely material system, is the only view which can be logically held. Indeed, it must be obvious to any one that the qualities which remove a germ so far from the inorganic world are due to something which is more than, and different from, the mere energies of the physical constituents of the cell.

Thus far it is seen that, by a consideration of both the inorganic and organic worlds, we are left with the logical conclusion that visible things are manifestations of things that are invisible, of realities that manifest themselves, of powers in control. The mere matter composing organic cells or germs, the chemist tells us, is entirely decomposable into elementary indivisible and indestructible particles which possess unalterable qualities. A dead cell may be a complex composition, but it has lost all that gave it importance as an organic body—namely, the powers to feed, to grow, to reproduce and to exhibit what is physiologically known as "irritability." These are qualities which, as Lord Kelvin has observed, cannot be manufactured; and, whatever is made to account for them, it is evidently a something which is significant of order and purpose and quite as specific in its nature as any chemical element, as is made evident by its definite order of behavior. If these life-properties were simply the product of the properties of matter, then, in one way or another, they would answer to the tests of matter, which they do not; while it is an axiom of science that things which do not react to the same tests are not of the same category or kinship. And, since nothing can produce nothing, a phenomenon of any kind must represent *something*.

And once a something is admitted to exist, it must be admitted to exist forever, unless it can be shown to be decomposable into various constituents. But, so far as we know, the organizing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power of a germ is incapable of being decomposed into independent parts, and therefore, as an individuality it can neither destroy itself nor be destroyed. It is as much a specific entity at one time as another. No other conclusion is warranted by the dogma of science that we shall not believe without evidence.

If we turn from the structurally blank germ-cell to an inspection of its highest development as seen in adult man, we shall observe a much greater complexity of phenomena which cannot be accounted for by any physical tests. Indeed, from a scientific view-point, the whole question of personal immortality may be decided upon the demonstrable relationship of the brain to the phenomena collectively known as "mind," for it is generally believed that, in one way or another, the brain is either the seat of the mind or that mind is a product of the brain. To render a decision, two questions must be answered, namely: (1) are brain and mind separable? and (2) if they are separable, is mind an indivisible unit? The first question will be affirmed if it can be shown that brain and mental phenomena are not parallel to each other in all their conditions—that is to say, if they are not invariably associated in the same relations or proportions as would necessarily be the case if mind were a mere product of the brain and entirely dependent upon it. This much accomplished, it will then only remain to be shown that mind is an indivisible unit, to meet the requirements of scientific exaction and receive the verdict which science renders regarding all individualities, namely, endless existence.

Those who hold the opinion that mind does not exist as an entity, but is simply a manifestation of brain-cell activity, base their assumption upon the observation that mental phenomena are influenced by physical conditions, including disease and drugs. Such observations, however, only show that the sensory or motor organs and their associating lines are crippled or perverted in their serviceability as agents of the mind, and consequently the mind is, in some degree or other, thrown out of its normal experience and mode of exercise. Restore the brain functions, and the mind is restored to its usual freedom and modes of activity. The condition is merely a problem of deranged environment.

Of late years, the "localization theory" of the brain—the theory of special functions for special parts—which is supported by experiments upon monkeys, dogs, etc., and also by the fre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quent observations that diseases of special parts of the brain in man often show a functional correspondence with the experiments on animals,—has influenced some persons in favor of the nonentity of mind.

But, in so far as the brain is a mechanical centre of association for the nerves coming and going from all parts of the body, so far we would naturally expect to find that special parts of its mechanism would represent special organs and functions of the body. But observations have extended farther than this; for it has been found that certain parts of the brain, when diseased, have frequently, but not invariably, been represented by some form of mental defect, such as mind-blindness, mind-deafness, or some break among the threads of memory, according to the part of the brain affected. While such observations cannot reasonably be disputed, their explanation on a materialistic basis is absolutely untenable, inasmuch as all parts of the brain thus involved have often been found diseased or absent without ever having manifested any of the symptoms which the parallelism of the materialistic theory would necessitate, or even any symptoms whatever. As Sir Charles Beevor, in his summing up of the evidences of tumors of the brain, says:*

"Tumors may occur without giving rise to the symptoms which would be expected, and tumors may give rise to symptoms which are associated with other parts of the brain, and tumors may occur without giving any symptoms at all, although situated in parts of the brain whose functions are considered to be known."

Such observations effectually destroy any theory of mind localization in the brain which makes particular mental phenomena a mere product of particular parts of the brain. But we will consider the brain in its front, back and middle divisions.

Professor Schaefer, of Edinburgh University, whose name is chiefly associated with researches upon the functions of the brain, states† that Welt has collected fifty-nine cases of lesions confined to the frontal region of the brain in man, forty-seven of which (about eighty per cent.) showed no changes in either intellectual capacity or in character, and only twelve of the total number had such changes recorded. Schaefer farther remarks that in several

* "Brain," autumn, 1898.
† Schaefer's "Physiology," Vol. 2, p. 773.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monkeys he has completely removed both frontal lobes "without producing the slightest sign of the mental and intellectual dulness and alteration of character which has been regarded as pathognomonic of a lesion of this region" (p. 772, Vol. 2). The case recorded by Dr. Francis,* and one by myself,† had each extensive destruction of both frontal lobes, and yet neither of the subjects exhibited any mental aberration or anything else that could not be accounted for by mere loss of nervous energy. Many other cases could be cited, bearing upon the functions of the frontal lobes of the brain, with the same result in their showing.

The middle third of the brain is the area recognized as containing the executive centres for motion and general sensation. Yet, even these centres are not indispensable for the performance of the functions with which they seem to be usually associated. And it is hardly remarkable that this middle area of the brain (parietal lobes), rather than the frontal lobes (as Schaefer remarks), has been especially found to be developed in some men of genius—namely, Bach, Beethoven, Döllinger, Gauss, Liebig and Kant. But, as showing that even the middle third of the brain is not indispensable for mental integrity, I will cite three or four cases in point. Professor Putnam, of Harvard University, records the case of a man, thirty years of age,‡ whose entire left side of the brain (excepting the posterior lobe and lower portions of the frontal and temporal lobes) was destroyed by a diseased growth "which everywhere compressed the adjoining brain tissues, and to a great extent destroyed them"; and yet, in this man, "no notable mental changes were observable . . . His mind was clear and he read and understood with pleasure, and enjoyed the society of his family and friends; and although he dragged his right leg, he walked well, going to church and back, half a mile off, and he drove his horse to town, eight miles away, four days before his death."

Dr. Pierce Bailey, of Columbia University, records the case§ of a man, aged fifty-seven years, the entire right side of whose brain was destroyed of its gray-matter cells, while a large cyst containing a straw-colored fluid occupied the frontal lobes of the same side. Yet, says Dr. Bailey:

* "American Journal of Medical Science," June, 1895.
† "Philadelphia Medical Journal," June 21, 1899.
‡ "Boston Medical and Surgical Journal," February 9, 1899.
§ "American Journal of Medical Science," March, 1899.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Up to the last his speech was perfectly normal, reading was not interfered with, and memory was unaffected. He was courteous and intelligent and patient; he was cheerful and attentive, and his power of attention was very good. He read the papers constantly, liked to talk politics, and was interested in the affairs of the hospital. He was singularly free from periods of depression, of emotional excitement, of irritability, of apathy, or of any other mental manifestation so common in gross brain diseases. He was cleanly, and in the three years of daily observation upon him there was nothing whatever at any time to indicate that his character or mental capacity was in the slightest affected."

Dr. W. B. Haddon, of St. Thomas's Hospital, London, records the case* of a man, twenty-one years of age, with an enormous tumor occupying the left side of the brain and severely compressing adjacent structures. Yet, says Dr. Haddon:

"Although he occasionally had an epileptic fit and stammered slightly from childhood, he had no paralysis. He was somewhat opinionated, but evinced no moral perversion. At the time of his death (he died in a fit) he was clerk in the steward's office of St. Thomas's Hospital, and a few days later he would have entered the government examination for a second-grade certificate in perspective and drawing, branches in which he was pronounced by experts to be exceptionally proficient."

Professor Andral, of the University of Paris, records the case† of a man, twenty-eight years of age, who had the whole of the right half of his brain so completely atrophied that its covering membrane (*pia mater*) formed a cyst in which there was not a trace of brain tissue. The floor of the cyst was formed by the optic thalamus, the corpus striatum, and the parts on a level with these two bodies. Yet, says Andral, this man "had received a good education, had a good memory, and exhibited as much intelligence as most men."

In regard to the posterior third of the brain, which includes what is regarded as a centre for vision, a like array of testimony can be produced—namely, the existence of more or less extensive tumors without vision or mind being deranged. Professor Henchen collected eleven cases‡ in which there existed more or less extensive disease of the posterior lobes without vision being affected. Dr. Ferrier, in his work, "The Functions of the Brain," says:

* "Brain," January, 1889.
† "Reference Handbook of the Medical Sciences," Vol. 4, p. 97.
‡ "Brain," Vol. 15, p. 177.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Though the occipital lobes (posterior) are included in the visual centres, it is, nevertheless, a remarkable fact that they can be injured or cut off bodily, almost up to the parieto-occipital fissure, on one or both sides simultaneously, without the slightest appreciable impairment of vision. This fact, which I have already observed in my former experiments, has been completely confirmed by Professor Yeo and myself and also by Professors Horsley and Schaefer."

In respect to the influence of form of brain upon mental phenomena, it can be pointed out that even the thick band of fibres, known as the *corpus callosum,* and which joins the two halves of the brain, connecting all parts of one half with all parts of the other, is not an essential organ for the free and normal action of the mind. Dr. W. W. Ireland has recently stated that there are at least six such illustrations on record. Three cases are noted in my own little work, "Brain and Mind." Nor are the convolutions or folds upon the surface of the brain significant of any mental quality so far as known. I need only refer to the charts of the brains of Gauss and Chauncey Wright, the two eminent mathematicians. The brain of Gauss, as recorded by Rudolph Wagner, was very markedly excessive in folds compared with the average brain; while the brain of Wright is described by Professor Dwight, of Harvard, as being simpler in its folds than the brain of a Venus Hottentot (a form of African idiot). The same disparity exists among the lower animals, for we observe that the resourceful beaver and the marmoset ape have no surface folds to their brains, while such folds are found to exist in the brains of animals so low down the scale of mammals as the echidna and macropus.

So much for the essential relationship of brain to mind. It must be sufficiently evident to any one that the facts here presented, which are only a few of many recorded, conclusively demonstrate that there is no invariable parallelism between brain condition or form and mental phenomena, such as should and would exist if the mind were a mere product of the brain. And, in thus demonstrating the separability of mind from brain, we have also demonstrated the unity or individuality of mind; for we are all aware that our present mental activity is inseparable from our past experiences, however dead our feelings may be to remote events. Memory is thus seen to be not only the basis of mental growth, but the sign of an indissoluble power making for a purpose that knows no end.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet, in spite of all evidences to the contrary, we still hear of "memory cells," as if bodies of matter, which are constantly changing their own constituents, could retain an infinite number and variety of successive impressions without the one impression destroying the other. It is surely evident to all that no impression can become an image or idea until it has been interpreted, which is an operation that cannot be conceived as being a function of matter. And because all impressions have to be recognized or interpreted to be known, that is to say, perceived and related, it becomes quite intelligible how the same idea can be secured through very different organic channels, a fact which is well illustrated by the case of Miss Helen Keller, who has attained to a college education through the sense of touch alone.

It may farther be observed that impressions of the most common experiences are usually interpreted automatically, that is to say, more rapidly than a conscious process. But, whenever an organ of sense becomes disordered, then it is that an ordinary impression, or no impression at all from the outside, may give rise to some form of illusion or hallucination, as the case may be, through the production of a misleading suggestive influence upon the mind. It is the disease, or functional disorder, of the brain or its connections which has perverted the impression or produced a perversion. It is only to be expected that the various organized channels of the brain shall normally bear some correspondence of a "press the button" order in relation to the activities of the mind. But it appears that it is only a conditional or cultivated correspondence. It is merely the relationship of master to servant, the mind proving itself the rightful master by its demonstrated ability to substitute one servant for another and still retain its own integrity. Death is but an eclipse, while genius as differing from insanity and imbecility is merely a question of degree of energy and its efficient control.

J. Sanderson Christison.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTROL OF EMIGRATION IN EUROPE.

BY JAMES DAVENPORT WHELPLEY.

A DECREASE of about 50,000 as compared with the previous year is a feature of the immigration returns of the United States for 1904. This decrease can be attributed almost entirely to vigorous administration of the American laws and more determined effort on the part of foreign governments to keep their people at home. That this decrease is due more to legal restriction than to a natural lessening of the number of emigrants is also shown by the fact that during the same period the movement into England, a country with no restriction upon immigration, increased to a marked degree. The English immigration was largely from Russia, where there are legal restrictions upon emigration, it is true, but where these restrictions are notoriously evaded.

The decrease of immigration into the United States was most marked from Italy, Austria-Hungary and Russia, countries furnishing the largest objectionable element. There was an increase from Great Britain and Germany, where the percentage of desirable emigrants is high. The emigration from Italy, Austria-Hungary and Russia is carried by the English and German steamship lines, the officials of which exercise considerable vigilance in preventing the embarkation of passengers who are likely to be refused admission at American ports. Thus the American restriction law operates, not only at points where it is enforced, but also in foreign countries where the American government has no legal jurisdiction over the movement of population.

Emigration from European countries during the past year was larger than ever before recorded; and, had the United States and Canada placed no restraint upon the movement towards North America, over a million aliens would have undertaken the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

journey, instead of less than nine hundred thousand. The deportation of objectionable persons who arrive at American seaports, and the exclusion of like individuals along the northern and southern borders of the country, even though those denied admission are numbered by the thousand, affect but a few compared to the vast total rejected for passage by the transportation companies and those who are deterred from beginning the journey through fear that they will be turned back at the point of embarkation for the sea voyage. At Naples alone, in a single year, 10,000 applicants for passage were refused by the steamship companies because of evident inability to meet the requirements of the American law. That immigration restriction laws do restrict, if enforced with the vigor and honesty which mark the American administration, does not admit of argument.

For many years, the American people have carried on their fight single-handed against the admission of objectionable aliens. The day is apparently drawing near when the cooperation of foreign governments will be secured in reducing the volume of emigrant movement. This assistance will not be given in any spirit of international good-will—in fact, quite the contrary, for foreign governments are only considering the matter because they are driven to it in self-defence.

Great Britain occupies the peculiar position of being the only European country suffering from the evils of both immigration and emigration. Both of these movements of population have assumed large proportions. The loss of desirable citizens is, beyond controversy, a serious evil, and during the past year there has been a notable exodus of agricultural and skilled labor from England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland. The governments of Continental Europe long ago took steps to discourage this class of emigration. Through the surveillance over the citizen which is given by a system of enforced military service and the requirement of passports from those leaving, it is possible to place some check upon the outflow. The British citizen, with his greater personal liberty, is free to go at will, there being no obligation to his government and no requirement but the price to hinder his leaving.

The effect of one system is that the adventurous, skilful and desirable British citizen takes his departure in hopes of bettering his condition, while the deficient or unfortunate citizen falls back

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon that wonderful institution, British charity, for his maintenance, for British steamship companies are too well aware of the penalties involved to wittingly undertake the transportation of the latter to America. The Continental system is more apt to result in the desirable citizen's being persuaded, either by force, argument or promise of betterment, to stay at home, while no obstacle is placed in the path of the pauper, the criminal or the deficient who can arrange for his passage to a foreign land.

It has as yet never been seriously suggested in Great Britain that there should be any restriction placed upon emigration, and while it is possible that, following the enactment of a law restricting immigration, there may be some agitation of the matter, it will probably be many years before Great Britain adopts a form of restriction law which is rapidly becoming a feature of legislation in every Continental country. One potent reason for this belief is that on the Continent the laws are based upon minute control of emigration business and traffic, to a degree which would be deeply resented by powerful British commercial and transportation interests.

The antagonism of these same interests is felt even in the effort to enact an immigration law, but the positive and ever-present evils of unrestricted immigration have been so borne in upon the wage-earners of Great Britain that no "interest" can long render futile the demand of the native population that some barrier be erected, not only against the insanitary alien, but against the competitive alien as well.

For years England has been a sort of clearing-house for undesirable emigration to the United States from many countries. Many emigrants rejected for passage at Continental ports found it easier to get to England than to return to their homes. The enormous alien and British emigrant traffic from British ports has resulted in the refuse being left upon British soil. The greater number of deportations from the United States are returned to England, even though they may have come originally from other foreign countries. The effect of this upon British population is almost indescribable. Charitable institutions, prisons and hospitals are crowded with aliens, and some of the trades are so burdened with this low grade of labor that the British workman is driven out.

The reactionary effect upon emigration to North America is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also thoroughly bad, for even if once defeated in his purpose the alien in England never quite gives up hope of being able to continue his journey, and in many cases, with a slight improvement in physical or financial condition, he is able to accomplish it. No law could be adopted by a foreign country which would be of more practical benefit to the United States than the immigration restriction act which the English people now have under consideration as a measure of self-defence.

With some slight exception, there is no restraint upon immigration into any Continental country. Passports are quite generally required of foreigners, though often not demanded unless the visit to the country be extended. Every arrival, however, is reported to the police within twenty-four hours, and data as to the name of the person, his or her age, nationality and profession are required. Russia requires a passport before foreigners are allowed to cross the border, but that country is now an exception to the general rule. To take up residence in Switzerland, permission must be secured from the communal authorities. France occupies a unique position in requiring that emigrants entering the country from the land side shall have at least forty dollars for each adult and sixteen dollars for each child, while those entering by a seaport are required to have at least thirty dollars for each adult and twelve dollars for each child. The French laws and regulations now in force are designed, not so much for the control of immigration and emigration, as for the control of the considerable and decidedly objectionable trans-France emigrant- traffic from the Levant *viâ* Marseilles and Havre, or some other French port.

The countries of the European Continent have given forth over 20,000,000 of their population to contribute to the building up of the American nation. In earlier years, the movement was from Germany, Scandinavia, Denmark, Holland and France, and a majority of the emigrants were of a class welcome in any part of the world, especially where thrift, industry and intelligence were needed to develop a new country. As opportunity for other than manual work grew less in the United States, as the arable free land disappeared, and, indeed, as the supply of adventurous, intelligent emigrants became exhausted in the countries of origin, the movement subsided, but only for a short time.

The people of other nations, such as Italy, Austria-Hungary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Russia, discovering that it was easy to get to America, and learning that conditions were far more favorable there than at home, then began to move. The tide rose rapidly to tremendous volume, but the high quality of the earlier emigration was lacking. A distinctly lower and even dangerous tone characterized the more recent movement, and the American people, becoming alarmed for the safety of their institutions, legislated barriers through which immigrants were required to pass before being admitted. At first, little was done in Europe to put a stop to the tremendous loss of population which was threatened, except to demand that every citizen should perform his military service before leaving. Emigrant traffic had in the mean time become a most profitable business. Great fleets of vessels were operated by reason of it, and competition for passengers reached the point where it became absolutely necessary in the interests of humanity as well as public policy to put some restraint upon the energy and enterprise of the ticket-sellers and to check, if possible, the exodus of laborers. Police regulations were found entirely inadequate to cope with the situation.

In 1860, France adopted a law which required a license for the conduct of emigration business, and imposed some regulations upon shipping in the interest of the emigrant. In 1876, Belgium adopted a law containing the same provisions as the French measure, but more elaborate in detail. Emigration agencies were placed under government control and an elaborate scheme of regulation for emigrant shipping was devised. These regulations are now somewhat antiquated, and a revision is under consideration. Both the French and Belgian laws were evidently enacted for the purpose of securing, if possible, some of the profitable emigrant traffic which was then in progress through German ports, and it may be said that a certain degree of success rewarded the effort. The Belgian government now maintains a rather hostile attitude towards any foreign interference or even observation of her emigrant traffic. The Belgian emigration commissioners are exceedingly jealous of their powers, and have constituted themselves the sole judges as to the qualifications of those who shall be permitted to depart. The steamship companies operating between the important emigration port of Antwerp and the United States are forced to discriminate according to the requirements of the American law; but, owing to the attitude of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Belgian government, they are deprived of such assistance as is rendered by representatives of the American government at a number of ports in other countries.

In 1888, Switzerland enacted a law which is still in force and which has served as a model for the lawmakers of other countries in framing similar legislation. Indiscriminate ticket-selling was stopped by providing for a limited number of agencies. Advertising was prohibited and the business of the agencies which were licensed and bonded was placed under the direct and detailed supervision and inspection of government officials. To urge a Swiss citizen to emigrate was made a crime under the law, and many similar provisions were rigorously enforced to the end that emigration should be free from any artificial stimulus. The Swiss law, unlike some others enacted since, is not entirely selfish; for, in the interest of the emigrant, an agent is forbidden to forward any person without a passport and identification paper or any person who cannot be admitted to the country of destination. This latter clause, while calculated to prevent loss and suffering to the Swiss emigrant, is also of great value to a country like the United States, for it guarantees the arrival at American ports of very few who need be regarded with suspicion.

The Swiss law was drawn with the purpose of making emigration difficult for Swiss citizens. It was also framed so as not to interfere with the large and profitable emigration movement across Switzerland from other countries, but in such a manner as to hold those who handled it responsible for every action detrimental to the Swiss people. Heavy bonds were exacted and severe fines and penalties were provided for all violations of the law or government regulations. There is one omission in the Swiss law which is most advantageous to the Swiss emigration agencies, but a source of considerable loss and trouble to Italy. No provision is made whereby the Swiss government can check a rate war between rival transportation companies. This is accomplished in Italy and Hungary by a clause in the emigration laws of those countries, which allows the government supervision over the rates at which passages from a native to a foreign port can be sold. It was undoubtedly not thought of as a possible measure of regulation of emigration when the Swiss law was enacted. The laws of Italy and Hungary are of subsequent enactment, but no move has been made by the Swiss government to take to itself

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this important authority by further legislation. It will not be done, in all probability, for some time at least; for when steamship rate wars are in progress among the transatlantic lines, a case in point occurring during the past year, Italy maintains a fixed rate on vessels sailing from Italian ports, and the Swiss agencies are thus enabled to successfully compete with the Italian agencies, and divert much business to the northern route by offering lower-priced passages to Italian emigrants.

If all the countries of Europe should enter into an agreement to restrain emigration by requiring official approval of the price at which a ticket could be sold, as is now done individually by Italy, Hungary and Austria, the result would be most beneficial, not only to the countries now losing population, but to the countries attempting to raise the standard of admission. The effect of the recent rate war was unquestionably most deplorable in many of its aspects, not upon the transportation companies, but upon the people who were thus induced to emigrate and the countries called upon to exercise renewed vigilance in enforcing the laws against admitting those likely to become public charges.

Up to 1897, Germany controlled emigration more by police regulation than in any other way. The performance of military service was the test of the right of a German citizen to leave his country. Thousands of emigrants evaded the law, and thus voluntarily exiled themselves. It was not until the great mass of German emigration recorded of the past fifty years had crossed the border that the German government took cognizance of the possibility of holding this movement in check, and devised a measure dealing with the question in a more scientific manner. The German law of 1897 is looked upon as one of the simplest and most effective of its kind. It does not assume to give the government such detailed control of private transportation interests as do the laws of some other countries, and thus meets with heartier approval from English and American critics.

In brief, the law forbids the emigration of a German citizen who has not fulfilled the requirements of his military obligation, places the regulation of emigration agencies under special government officials appointed for that purpose, and affords every emigrant sailing from a German port full protection and safety through shipping regulations and fines and penalties for agents who fail to live up to contracts made for transportation. Even

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the form of contract which shall be used in each case is especially designated. This law works to the benefit of foreigners sailing from German ports, as well as of German citizens.

The emigration of German citizens has decreased of late years, so much so that at the present time only between thirty and forty thousand are leaving the country annually. American statistics would indicate a larger movement than this, but many German-speaking residents of other European countries are accredited to the German Empire by reason of racial origin. There is an enormous trans-Germany emigration movement, however, and it is in the handling of several hundred thousand foreign emigrants that the administration has been most instructed. Germany is the great highway from Russia to the west, and until Austria-Hungary made special arrangements to develop the Mediterranean port of Fiume, by establishing a direct line of steamers to the United States, a large proportion of the emigration from the south also sailed from German ports. This great movement of people is conducted to the least possible detriment of German citizens and the highest possible profit of local transportation interests. There can be no loitering by the way, for Germany does not want these people, and her police take good care that they do not remain in German territory. There can be no indirect emigration, for the German lines to the United States are keen competitors of the English lines, and, if possible, every passenger for a transatlantic port is forced to take passage on a German ship. The American standard of admission is applied to all who seek to cross from Austria and Russia into Germany, and thus the American immigration law operates in remote parts of the world with a force almost equal to a local statute.

In 1901, the present Italian emigration law went into effect. Over two million citizens had left that country for the United States in the preceding twenty-five years, and some sections of southern Italy had become almost depopulated through this exodus. Bad economic conditions were responsible for the beginnings of this movement; but encouragement from those who had emigrated and the activity of ticket agents in persuading others to follow increased the departures from year to year, until something in the nature of a crisis was reached. For many years, money has been sent from the United States to Italy to assist emigration. Last year nearly twenty-five million dollars was re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mitted by Italians in America, and most of this money was for the purpose stated. The Italian emigration law is drawn with the intent of meeting all of these conditions, so far as is possible. The law is lengthy and the rules and regulations for its enforcement are extraordinarily detailed. Some difficulty has been experienced in carrying them into practical effect; but the authorities are apparently well satisfied that everything possible is being done to check emigration, and to care for those who take passage abroad not only while on their way to their destination, but after their arrival in a foreign land.

The Italian law to all intents and purposes puts the business of emigrant transportation into the hands of the government, inasmuch as only a limited number of people can engage therein, and these few are heavily bonded against damage claims and fines and penalties for violation of the law. The business is under constant and minute inspection by government officials with almost unlimited power. No citizen can lawfully emigrate without the government's being fully aware of his intention and giving permission for him to go. Agents are not allowed to solicit business or to advertise. Emigrants can only go to countries where conditions meet with the approval of the Italian government. A case in point is Brazil, to which country went many Italian emigrants a few years ago. Conditions were unfavorable and great distress followed. Emigration to Brazil is now prohibited. Rates of passage to transatlantic countries must have the approval of the emigration officials. A special court is created to deal with damage suits, claims and other controversies arising between agents and passengers. Information is furnished to intending emigrants as to conditions in the countries of their destination. Foreign agencies are maintained to assist, protect and help in every way Italian citizens abroad, and special facilities are provided for the sending of money to the home country.

What is of greatest importance to the United States is the willingness of the Italian government to cooperate in every way to prevent violations of the American emigration law. American officials stationed in Italy are given almost official authority for the inspection of emigrants and emigrant-ships leaving Italian ports. The law is intended to be restrictive in effect, protective in character and certainly constitutes the most notable effort ever made by any country to check and control an exodus of its citi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zens. It may be argued that, notwithstanding this law, the emigration from Italy is still greater than from any other country. This is true; but it is also true that no man can say how many thousand more people would leave each year but for this restraint. All conditions in Italy have tended to drive her people forth to better themselves; and, once the army was on the march, momentum was maintained and increased by the drawing power of those who had gone before as well as by the example set by these pioneers for those left behind. So long as economic conditions in southern Italy are bad, and prosperity is reported from the United States, just so long will the present movement continue. There can be no exhaustion of supply, for the population is increasing in spite of the loss by emigration.

Unfortunately, however, the character of the emigration is not improving—in fact, quite the contrary. The rising generation is of the towns and cities rather than of the country. The assisted emigrant is not so desirable as the emigrant who departs on his own initiative. The objectionable feature of the present movement is largely counteracted, however, by the increasing vigilance of the American authorities and the friendly cooperation of the Italian government in matters of administration.

In 1903, the government of Hungary, a country which is suffering almost equally with Italy a great loss of population through emigration, put into force a restrictive law which is up to the present time the most drastic of its kind. In addition to adopting practically all of the features of the Italian law, the Hungarian measure gives the government the power to name the routes by which emigrants shall leave the country, inasmuch as it serves notice that by any other route than that designated no government protection shall be given the traveller. This clause was adopted to force the development of the port of Fiume on the Mediterranean, and it has already resulted in a direct line of steamers to the United States from that port and a loss to the German ports of a great amount of business formerly derived from Austria-Hungary.

The Austrian parliament will shortly enact an emigration law similar to the one in force in Hungary. There is an interesting feature of the proposed Austrian law, however, which marks a new departure in government control of emigration. In all other European laws, an emigrant is defined as one who goes abroad

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for long and continued residence. The Austrian measure defines that term as meaning any citizen who goes abroad to earn his living. This is evidently intended to give the government even closer control over the movement of population than is the case in other countries, to apply the law to laborers emigrating only for a season and to those crossing the land borders into neighboring European countries. There is a large emigration from Austria-Hungary to Roumania, and many thousands go and come from near-by sections of Europe, the movement depending upon the demand for laborers at home.

The Russian government maintains strict control of emigration traffic, and the provisions of the law requiring permission to leave are most severe. Emigration from Russia has been particularly heavy since the beginning of the war with Japan. The performance of military service is a *sine qua non* for obtaining a passport, but thousands of Russians have left without, crossing the border under the guidance of agents who make a business of smuggling emigrants out of the country. As soon as the border is crossed, the emigrants are taken up by the German railroad and transported to Hamburg or Bremen, from which points they go to the United States, Holland or England.

In the other northern European countries, Holland, Denmark and Scandinavia, emigration is carefully watched and controlled by government authorities, to the end that the laws of the respective countries shall be observed in the matter of departures, and the emigrants themselves fully protected in their dealings with transportation agents and ship-owners. In Spain and Portugal, the regulation of emigration is largely a police function, the enforcement of military service being almost the sole reason for any restraint upon the outward movement of population.

France, therefore, is really the only European country which at present makes a definite demand upon an immigrant in deciding as to his qualifications for admittance, and that demand is represented merely by a small sum of money, such as is deemed sufficient to carry the traveller across French territory or to guarantee his maintenance for a reasonable time while arrangements are being made to become self-supporting. England is the only European country in which immigration restriction has become an economic necessity and is, in consequence, a live political issue. On the other hand, notwithstanding the great loss to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population annually through emigration, England is practically the only European country which does not now place considerable restraint upon citizens contemplating departure.

The entire tendency of European legislation in regard to immigration and emigration is now most favorable to the United States. The more careful England becomes as to who shall be admitted to English territory, and the greater the effort made by European countries to keep their people at home, the less the strain upon the American immigration barriers. The situation is most hopeful from an American point of view. Nearly every European country now compels an emigrant to secure a passport or some other form of identification paper before leaving; transportation interests are now quite generally restrained from inciting emigration; and, in many countries, such as England, Italy, Hungary and Russia, economic or political evils which have the effect of driving people from their homes are recognized and no inconsiderable effort is being made to remedy them. These influences are working to the good of all concerned.

Unfortunately, good laws do not always make good governments, and even honest and intelligent government is not always entirely effective. To restrain desirable citizens from leaving their native land is one thing, but to ignore or even expedite the departure of paupers, criminals and deficients is another. It is this last-named feature of the situation which prevents the United States from reaping full benefit from the restrictive legislation of Europe; it is because of this that never for a moment can vigilance relax in the administration of the American exclusion laws. The situation is grave and threatening; for, no matter how favorable to the United States may be the laws of Europe as applied to emigration, until each nation is compelled by sentiment from within or without to bear its own social burdens, they will be unloaded as freely as possible along the line of least resistance. An emigration tide unless thoroughly policed carries with it the germs of anarchy, crime, disease and degeneracy. Tremendous progress in the direction of better control has been made throughout the world in the past twenty-five years. Bearing this record of actual facts in mind, uniformity of law and administration, and greater regard among nations for one another's safety, do not appear to be impossibilities in the future.

JAMES DAVENPORT WHELPLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN APOLOGY FOR TECHNIC.

BY BRANDER MATTHEWS, PROFESSOR OF DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

If the chief end of all art is delight, there is small blame to be attached to most of us in that we are glad to take our pleasure carelessly and to give little thought to the means whereby we have been moved. Properly enough, the enjoyment of most of us is unthinking; and in the appreciation of the masterpieces of the several arts few of us are wont to consider curiously the craftsmanship of the men who wrought these marvels, their skill of hand, their familiarity with the mechanics of their art, their consummate knowledge of technic. Our regard is centred rather on the larger aspects of the masterwork, on its meaning and on its veracity, on its intellectual elevation and on its moral appeal. No doubt this is best, for it is only by its possession of these nobler qualities that a work of art endures. On the other hand, these nobler qualities by themselves will not suffice to confer immortality, unless they are sustained by the devices of the adroit craftsman. As Massinger asserted long ago:

> "No fair colors
> Can fortify a building faintly joined."

Technic is most successful when its existence is least suspected, and this is one reason why it is often overlooked and neglected in the very achievements which owe to its aid their vitality. Perhaps this happens the more frequently because it is the affectation of many an artist to hurry his tools out of sight as swiftly as he can, and to sweep up the chips of his workshop as soon as may be, so that the result of his effort shall seem almost as though it were the sudden effect of the inspiration that is believed to visit a genius now and again. He may have toiled at it un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceasingly for months, joying in the labor and finding keen pleasure in every workmanlike artifice he had used to attain his end; and yet he refrains from confessing his many struggles with his rebellious material, wisely preferring to let what he has done speak for itself, simply and without commentary. But the artists know that the pathway to achievement is never along the line of least resistance; and they smile when they hear Mascarille, in Molière's little comedy, tell the affected young ladies whom he is seeking to impress that all he did "was done without effort." By this the artists at once perceive the fellow to be a pretender, who had never accomplished anything and who never would. They know, as no others can know, that there is no cable-road to the tops of the twin-peaks of Parnassus, and that he who would climb to these remote heights must trudge afoot,—even if he is lucky enough now and again to get a lift on Pegasus.

What the artists do not care to parade, it is the duty of the commentators to point out; and an understanding of the technic of any art, of its possibilities and of its limitations, is as necessary for the critics as for the creators. Perhaps it is not pedantic to suggest that the critic who seeks to be of service ought to be able to see in every masterpiece the result of the combined action of three forces, without any one of which that work of art could not have come into being. First, there is the temperament of the artist himself, his native endowment for the practice of that special art, his gift of story-telling or of play-making, as the case may be. Second, there is the training of the artist, his preparation for his work, his slowly acquired mastery of the processes of his craft, his technical accomplishments. And, thirdly, there is the man's own character, his intelligence, and energy and determination, his moral sense, his attitude toward life and its insistent problems. Now, of these three necessary factors—first, his native gift; second, his technic; and, third, his character—only the second is improvable by taking thought. The native gift must remain ever what it is, neither more nor less; and it cannot be enlarged by any effort of will. So also the character, which is conditioned by much that is beyond a man's control; which can be bettered, perhaps, but only as the man himself climbs upward.

Technic, however, can be had for the asking. Any man can acquire it if he will but pay the price,—the needful study and experiment. Any man can make himself a master of his craft,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if he will but serve his apprenticeship loyally. The beginner in painting, for example, can go into the studio of an older practitioner to get grounded in the grammar of his art, and to learn slowly how to speak its language, not eloquently at first, but so as to make his meaning clear. In that workshop he soon awakens to the fact that permanent success is never won by any audacity of ignorance, and that the most famous artists are those who acquainted themselves with every artifice of their craft and with every trick of the trade. They went to school to certain of their elders to acquire that tradition of technic, passed along from hand to hand, enriched by the devices of one after another of the strong men who had practised the art, following each in the other's footsteps and broadening the trail blazed by those who went first.

Every generation is privileged to stand on the shoulders of its predecessors, and it is taller by what they accomplished. The art of fiction, for example, is a finer art to-day than it was yesterday; and so is every other art, even though the artists themselves are no greater now than then, and even though genius is no more frequent than it was formerly. Ghirlandajo and Marlowe and Cervantes were men of genius; but their technic is seen to-day to be as primitive as their native talent is indisputable. We can perceive them doubtfully feeling for a formula, fumbling in the dark, for want of the model which they themselves were to aid in establishing and which every novice nowadays has ready to his hand, even though he lack the temperament to profit by what is set before him.

It is significant that not a few of the masters, in the days when they were but novices, found so much satisfaction in this mere acquiring of the secrets of the craft, that they chose to linger in the apprentice stage longer than might seem necessary. In their earlier work they were content modestly to put in practice the technical principles they had just been acquiring; and for a little while they sought scarcely more than mere technical adroitness. Consider the firstlings of Shakespeare's art and of Molière's; and observe how they reveal these prentice playwrights at work, each seeking to display his cleverness and each satisfied when he had done this. In "Love's Labor's Lost," Shakespeare is trying to amuse by inventive wit and youthful gayety and ingenuity of device, just as Molière in the "*Etourdi*" is enjoying his own complicating of comic imbroglios, not yet having any-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing of importance to say on the stage, but practising against the time when he should want to say something. Neither in the English comedy nor in the French is there any purpose other than the desire to please by the devices of the theatre.

There is so little hint of a deeper meaning in either "Love's Labor's Lost" or the "*Etourdi*," of a moral, so to speak, of a message of ulterior significance, that, if Shakespeare and Molière had died after these plays were produced, nobody would ever have suspected that either youthful playwright had it in him to develop into a philosophic observer of the deeper realities of life. Of course, neither of them was long satisfied with this dexterous display of technical adroitness alone; and, as they grew in years, we find their plays getting richer in meaning and dealing more seriously with the larger problems of existence. But technic was never despised; and, if it was not long the chief end of the playwright, it remained the means whereby he was enabled to erect the solid framework of masterpieces like "Othello" and "Tartuffe," in which the craftsmanship is overshadowed by the nobler qualities, no doubt, but in which the stark technical skill is really more abundant than in the earlier and emptier plays.

As Shakespeare and Molière matured mentally and morally, so also did they grow in facility of accomplishment, in the ease with which they could handle the ever-present problems of exposition and construction. The student of dramaturgy notes with intensifying delight the ingenuity with which the first appearance of Tartuffe is prepared; and he finds an almost equal joy in the bolder beginnings of "Romeo and Juliet" and of "Hamlet," where the difficulty was less, it may be, but where the interest of the craftsman in the excellence of his device is quite as obvious. Shakespeare was the greatest of dramatic poets and Molière was the greatest of comic dramatists; and both of them were good workmen, taking an honest pride in the neatness with which they finished a job. In his later years, Shakespeare seems to have a little relaxed his interest in technic, and the value of his work is at once seen to suffer. Although his mind is as powerful as ever up to the last years of his stay in London, "Cymbeline" and "A Winter's Tale" are far inferior to "Hamlet" and to "Macbeth"; and the cause is apparently nothing more than a carelessness of technic, an unwillingness to take as much trouble to master his material and to present it in due proportion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If Shakespeare and Molière ever meet in that other world which was so much in the mind of the one and so little in the thought of the other, and if they chance to fall into chat—Shakespeare spoke French, pretty certainly, even if Molière knew no English—we may rest assured that they will not surprise each other by idle questions about the meaning of this play or that, its moral purpose or its symbolic significance. We may be confident that their talk would turn promptly to technic; and, perhaps, Shakespeare would congratulate Molière on his advantage in coming later, when the half-open, semi-mediæval playhouse, with which the English dramatist had perforce to be contented, had been superseded by a more modern theatre, roofed and lighted and set with scenery. And, in his turn, Molière might be curious to inquire how the English playwright was able to produce upon the spectators the effect of a change of scene when, in fact, there was no actual scenery to change.

To suggest that these two masters of the dramatic art would probably confine their conversation to matters of mere technic is not so vain or adventurous as it may seem, since technic is the one theme the dramatists from Lope de Vega to Legouvé have always chosen to discuss, whenever they have been emboldened to talk about their art in public. Lope's "New Art of Writing Plays" is in verse, and it has taken for its remote model Horace's "Art of Poetry," but none the less does it contain the practical counsels of a practical playwright, advising his fellow craftsmen how best to succeed on the stage; and it is just as technical in its precepts as Mr. Pinero's recent lecture on the probable success of Robert Louis Stevenson as a dramatist, if only the Scots romancer had taken the trouble to learn the rules of the game, as it is played in the theatre of to-day.

In thus centring the interest of their public utterance upon the necessities of craftsmanship, the dramatists are in accord with the customs of the practitioner of all the other arts. Consider the criticism of poetry by the poets themselves, for example, —how narrowly it is limited to questions of vocabulary or of versification, whether the poet-critic is Wordsworth or Poe. Consider the criticism of painting by the painters themselves,—how frankly it is concerned with the processes of the art, whether the painter-critic is Fromentin or La Farge. It is La Farge who records that Rembrandt was a "workman following his trade of painting to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

live by it," and who reminds us that "these very great artists"—Rembrandt and his fellows—"are primarily workmen, without any pose or assumption of doing more than a daily task." What they did was all in the day's work. One of the most distinguished of American sculptors was once standing before a photograph of the Pan-Athenaic frieze, and a critical friend by his side expressed a wonder as to "what those old Greeks were thinking of when they did work like that"? The professional artist smiled and responded: "I guess that, like the rest of us, they were thinking how they could pull it off!"

The method, the tricks of the trade, the ingenious devices of one kind or another, these are what artists of all sorts like to discuss with fellow practitioners of the art; and it is by this interchange of experiences that the means of expression are multiplied. The inner meaning of what they have wrought, its message, its morality, its subtler spirit, the artists do not care ever to talk over, even with each other. This is intangible and incommunicable; and it is too personal, too intimate, to be vulgarized in words; it is to be felt rather than phrased. Above all, it must speak for itself, for it is there because it had to be there, and not because the artist put it there deliberately. If he has not builded better than he knew, then is the result of his labor limited and narrow. A story is told of Thorwaldsen in his old age, when a friend found him disconsolate before a finished statue and inquired if he was despondent because he had not been able to realize his ideal. And the sculptor responded that, on the contrary, he had realized his ideal, and therefore he was downcast; for the first time his hand had been able to accomplish all that his mind had planned.

"Neither in life, nor even in literature and in art, can we always do what we intend to do," M. Brunetière has declared, adding that, "in compensation, we have not always intended to do all that we have actually accomplished." Often no one is more astonished than the artist himself—be he poet or painter—at what the critics sometimes find in his work; and he is frankly unaware of any intention on his part to do all the fine things which he is told that he has done. But the critics may be justified, despite the disclaimer of the artist; and the fine things are, of a truth, to be discovered even though they get into the work by accident, as it were, and even though they may be the result of an inten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion which was either unconscious on the artist's part, or subconscious.

We cannot help feeling the sublimity so evident in the frescos of the Sistine Chapel; and yet it is equally evident—if we care to look for the evidence—that while he was on this work the mind of Michelangelo was absorbed by the conquest of a host of technical difficulties. Of course, it would be going too far to assert that the great artist did not actually intend the sublimity that we admire and wonder at; but we may be sure that this sublimity is not something deliberately planned and achieved by him. It is there because the theme evoked it, and because Michelangelo was himself a man of the noblest character and of the loftiest imagination. That was inherent and latent in him and had to come out, inevitably and mightily, when he was engaged on a work that tasked all his powers.

An ideal, a significance, a moral, that has to be inserted into a work of art and that might have been omitted, is not likely to be firmly joined; and it is liable to fall apart sooner or later. Morality, for example, is not something to be put in or left out, at the caprice of the creator; it is, as Mr. Henry James once called it, "a part of the essential richness of inspiration." Therefore the artist need not give weight to it. If his own soul is as clean as may be, and if his vision is clear, the moral of his work may be left to take care of itself. Nearly always when an artist has been over-anxious to charge his work with a moral message, writ so plain that all who run may read, he has failed to attain either of his ends, the ethical or the æsthetic. There is a purpose plainly expressed in Miss Edgeworth's "Moral Tales" and in her "Parent's Assistant"; and the result is that healthy girls and wholesome boys are revolted. There was no moral intent in her ever-delightful "Castle Rackrent"; and yet it has an ethical significance which few of its readers can have failed to feel.

Perhaps "Castle Rackrent" is the finest of Miss Edgeworth's stories, because it is the only one in which she had set herself a technical problem of exceeding difficulty. She chose to use the faithful old retainer to tell the tale of the family's downfall in consequence of its weakness, its violence, and its vice. Thady has never a word of blame for any son of the house he has served generation after generation. Indeed, he is forever praising his succession of masters; but so artfully does the author utilize the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

device of transparency that the reader is put in possession of the damning facts, one by one, and is soon able to see the truth of the matter which Thady himself has no thought of revealing,—which, in fact, he would probably deny indignantly if it was suggested by any one else.

The chief reason why the novel is still held to be inferior to the drama is to be found in its looseness of form. The novel is not strictly limited, as the play must be by the practical necessities of the theatre; and the practitioners of the art of fiction permit themselves a license of structure which cannot be but enfeebling to the artists themselves. Few of the novelists have ever gone about a whole winter with a knot in their foreheads, such as Hawthorne carried there while he was thinking out his "Scarlet Letter." And only by strenuous grappling with his obstacles was he able to attain the masterly simplicity of that Puritan tragedy. A resolute wrestling with difficulty is good not only for the muscles but also for the soul; and it may be because they know this that artists are inclined to go afield in search of difficulties to be overthrown, that they set themselves problems, that they accept limitations. Herein we may see a cause for the long popularity of the sonnet, with its restricted scheme of rhymes. Herein, again, we may see a reason for the desire of the novelist to try his fate as a dramatist. "To work successfully beneath a few grave, rigid laws," so Mr. James once asserted, "is always a strong man's highest ideal of success." The novelist fails as a dramatist, often because he has the gift of the story-teller only, and not that of the play-maker, but more often still because the writing of fiction has provided him with no experience in working beneath any law other than his own caprice.

The modern sculptor, by the mere fact that he may now order marble of any shape and of any size, finds his work far easier and, therefore, far less invigorating than it was long ago, when the artist needed to have an alerter imagination to perceive in a given piece of marble the beautiful figure he had to cut out of that particular block and no other. Professor Mahaffy has suggested that the decay of genius may be traced to the enfeebling facilities of our complex civilization. "In art," he maintained, "it is often the conventional shackles,—the necessities of rhyme and metre, the triangle of a gable, the circular top of a barrel—which has led the poet, the sculptor, or the painter to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strike out the most original and perfect products of their art. Obstacles, if they are extrinsic and not intrinsic, only help to feed the flame." Professor Butcher has declared that genius "wins its most signal triumphs from the very limitations within which it works." And this is what Gautier meant when he declared that the greater the difficulty the more beautiful the work; or, as Mr. Austin Dobson has paraphrased it:

> "Yes; when the ways oppose—
> When the hard means rebel,
> Fairer the work out-grows,—
> More potent far the spell."

Not only has many an addition to the accepted devices of the craft been the guerdon of a victorious grapple with a difficulty, but the successful effort to solve a purely technical problem has often led to an ennobling enlargement of the original suggestion, —with which the artist might have rested content if he had not been forced to the struggle. From the history of sculpture and of architecture here in the United States during the last years of the nineteenth century, it is easy to select two instances of this enrichment of the fundamental idea, as the direct consequence of an unexpected obstacle which the artist refused to consider a stumbling-block, preferring to make it a stepping-stone to a loftier achievement.

When the city of New York was making ready to welcome the men of the navy on their return from Manila and Santiago, the Architectural League offered to design a triumphal arch. The site assigned, in front of Madison Square, just where Broadway slants across Fifth Avenue, forced the architect to face a difficulty seemingly unsurmountable. The line of march was to be along Fifth Avenue, and, therefore, the stately monument was set astride that street. But the line of approach, for most of the multitude certain to come to gaze on the temporary addition to civic beauty, was along Broadway; and the arch built squarely across the avenue would seem askew to all who first caught sight of it from the other street. To avoid this unfortunate effect the designer devised a colonnade, extending north and south, up and down the avenue. Thus he corrected the apparent slant by emphasizing the fact that it was the avenue in which the arch was placed and not the more popular highway that chanced to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cut across it. But this colonnade, invented solely to solve a difficulty, lent itself readily to rich adornment. It became at once an integral element of the architectural scheme, to which it gave breadth as well as variety. It was accepted instantly as a welcome modification of the tradition,—as an amplification not to be wantonly disregarded by any architect hereafter called upon to design a triumphal arch.

To this illustration from architecture may be added another from sculpture, as suggestive and as useful in showing how a conquest of technical difficulty is likely ever to increase the resources of the art. The sculptor of the statue of Lincoln, which ennobles a park of Chicago, was instructed that the work of his hands was to stand upon a knoll, visible from all sides, stark against the sky, unprotected by any background of entablature or canopy. The gaunt figure of Lincoln is not a thing of beauty to be gazed at from all the points of the compass; and the stern veracity of the artist would not permit him to disguise the ill-fitting coat and trousers by any arbitrary draperies, mendaciously cloaking the clothes which were intensely characteristic of the man to be modelled. To shield the awkwardness of the effigy when seen from the rear, a chair was placed behind it; and so the sculptor was led to present Lincoln as the Chief Magistrate of the Republic, arisen from the chair of state, to address the people from whom he had received his authority. And thus, at that late day, at the end of the nineteenth century, Mr. Saint-Gaudens did a new thing; although there had been standing statues and seated statues, no sculptor had ever before designed a figure just rising from his seat.

It is by victories like these over technical difficulties that the arts advance; and it is in combats like these that the true artist finds his pleasure. The delight of battle is his, as he returns to the attack, again and again, until at last he wins the day and comes home laden with the spoil. The true artist hungers after technic for its own sake, well knowing the nourishment it affords. He even needlessly puts on fetters now and again, that he may find sharper zest in his effort. This ravenous appetite for technic leads many an artist to go outside his own art in search of unforeseen but fascinating difficulties. The painter is tempted to stretch his muscles by a tussle with the unknown obstacles of the sculptor; and the sculptor in his turn contends with the limita-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of the painter. Michelangelo called himself a sculptor and pretended to be no more; but in time he took up the trade of the architect, of the painter and of the poet. And this interchange of field in search of new worlds to conquer seems to be characteristic of the great periods of artistic activity and achievement. In all such periods, the more accomplished craftsmen have never wearied of technical experiment to the constant enrichment of the processes of their art.

It is the uncreative critics, it is never the creative craftsmen, who dwell on the danger of taking too much interest in technic. The critics may think that the more attention the artist pays to his manner, the less he has for his matter, and that he is in peril of sacrificing content to form. But the craftsmen themselves know better; they know that no one may surely separate manner and matter, form and content, Siamese twins often, coming into being at a single birth. Furthermore, the artist knows that technic is the one quality he can control, every man for himself, every man improving himself as best he can. His native gift, his temperament,—this is what it is; and what it is it must be; and no man can better it by taking thought. His character, also, the personality of the artist, that which gives a large meaning to his work,—how little can any man control this result of heredity and environment?

If an artist has anything to say it will out, sooner or later, however absorbed he may be in finding the best way of saying it. If he has nothing to say, if he has no message for the heart of man, he may at least give some pleasure to his contemporaries by the sheer dexterity of his craftsmanship. There would have been no more meaning in Poe's verse, if there had been less melody, if the poet had less devotedly studied the "book of iambs and pentameters." There would have been no larger significance in the painted epigrams of M. Gérôme, if that master of line had cared less for draughtsmanship. There would have been no more solid value in the often amusing plays of M. Sardou, if he had not delighted in the dexterity of his dramaturgical devices. At bottom, M. Sardou, M. Gérôme, and Poe had little or nothing to say; that is their misfortune, no doubt; but it is not their fault, for, apparently, each one of them made the best of his native gift.

In his time Milton was the most careful and conscientious of artists in verse-making, and so, in his turn, was Pope, whose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ideals were different, but whose skill was no less in its kind. So, again, was Tennyson untiring in seeking to attain ultimate perfection of phrase, consciously employing every artifice of alliteration, assonance and rhyme. But, if Milton's verse seems to us now noble and lofty, while Pope's appears to us as rather petty and merely clever, surely this is because Milton himself was noble and his native endowment lofty, and because Pope himself was petty and his gift only cleverness; surely it is not because they were both of them as much interested in the mechanics of their art as was Tennyson after them.

One of the wittiest critics of our modern civilization, the late Clarence King, remarked, some ten years ago, that the trouble with American fiction just then lay in the fact that it had the most elaborate machinery,—and no boiler. But the fault of our fiction then was to be sought in the absence of steam,—and the machinery stood ready to do its work, to the best advantage and with the utmost economy of effect, just so soon as the power might be applied.

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A WHITE SOUTH AFRICA.

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL F. G. STONE, R. G. A., FORMERLY DISTRICT COMMISSIONER AND RESIDENT MAGISTRATE IN THE STANDERTON DISTRICT, TRANSVAAL.

THE Transvaal has taken a leading part in the agitation for a so-called "White South Africa"; or, to put it in other words, to prevent the importation of any colored race into South Africa, but more especially into the Transvaal. There is a league with numerous branches called the "White League," which has existed ever since peace was restored to the country, and was called into existence for the ostensible purpose of preventing the importation of any person of color into the Transvaal; this League held meetings, the members made speeches which were fully reported in the newspapers, and they laid claim to the exercise of a certain amount of political influence: but irrespective of the White League, and more influential though less talkative, was the whole body of white storekeepers—I may explain that the term "storekeeper" includes any one who keeps the smallest general store in an up-country township. These storekeepers are in deadly earnest in the matter, they are fighting for their bread and butter; the political side of the question does not concern them, the labor question concerns them only indirectly, but what does concern them is to prevent any colored Oriental from setting up a rival store and underselling them. For them no Imperial sentiment exists, which would lead them to discriminate between an Indian fellow subject and a Chinaman. These are equally dangerous rivals, and as such they must not be admitted.

It is necessary to realize what the actual conditions are. The Transvaal is a country where the indigenous or native black man, commonly called a Kafir, is in an enormous numerical superiority. The said Kafir varies considerably in different parts of South

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Africa; the Basutos, for example, are about the best type of native, but—there are others! The average Kafir, on whom one has to depend in the Transvaal for labor, is a highly odorous and dirty savage, with less intelligence than it is possible to conceive, and whose only ambition in life is to make enough money with as little exertion as possible, to buy one or more wives to work for him for the rest of his useless life. The lowest kind of Kafir, morally, is probably the Mashona, but he does not emigrate from his own country; the vices practised by Mashonas of both sexes and all ages are quite indescribable, and the men are physically not formidable.

Kafir labor on the farms, and for domestic purposes, is quite as unattainable as it is for the mines and public works; in fact, dependence on Kafir labor makes domestic life a daily tragedy, farming and market-gardening almost impracticable, and large enterprises, such as railways, irrigation works, etc., a delusive dream. The domestic side of the question may not at first sight appear to be of vital importance, but if South Africa is ever to become in reality a white man's country, the conditions of domestic life must in the first instance be such that a man can marry and rear a family in decency and comfort. At present, there are two obstacles to the realization of this first condition; they are (*a*) the excessively high cost of living, which is due to the absence of reasonably cheap and efficient labor in every branch of industry, and (*b*) the impossibility of obtaining servants for domestic work. Let me give a typical instance. A friend of mine came over with one of the Australian contingents. He had eight or nine years' experience of farming in Australia, and had thoroughly mastered the subject. At the conclusion of the war, he bought a farm within easy distance of one of the principal towns in the Transvaal, on the main line of rail. I frequently visited him, and saw for myself the difficulties with which he had to contend. I have never seen a man work harder, or face difficulties with greater pluck. Frequently he was obliged to work in the fields like a laborer to save a crop, because he could get no Kafirs; and, after a day's hard work on the land, he would come home (save the mark!) to cook his own food, and turn out again at eleven at night to feed the cows. This state of affairs was not due to inability to pay wages, though they were so absurdly high; it was simply due to the fact that the Kafir had no need to work,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and therefore would not work. Now, here was one of the best type of settlers for a new colony, hard working, well educated, complete master of his business, in possession of the necessary capital to farm on the most approved principles and to tide over a few bad years without serious inconvenience. And yet—how could a man in such a position ask any woman to marry him, or contemplate rearing a family in such surroundings? I have seen a well-to-do merchant in an up-country town, with a large family of children of all ages, left absolutely without a single servant in the house, and compelled to sell his horses because he could get no one to look after them. He was a liberal paymaster, too. It must be thoroughly understood that, in a country which is principally populated by Kafirs, it is quite out of the question to expect any white man or woman to do laborer's work or serve in any menial capacity; the upper servants in a high-class establishment may be white, but the menial work is done by Kafirs.

The importation of Chinese for the mines really bears only indirectly on the question, inasmuch as this is indentured labor for a specific purpose, and the Chinaman is, under no circumstances, to be allowed to settle in the country, but must be sent back to his native land on the termination of his contract. The Chinaman bears on the situation to this extent, that the fact of his being employed on the mines has assured the maintenance, and we may hope the extension, of that industry, and consequently the employment of a large number of white men of every grade above that of laborer; and also, if the time ever should arrive when the supply of labor for the mines is more than equal to the demand, and the Chinaman is still imported on account of his superiority to the Kafir, then, and only then, will there be a supply of labor set free for railway and public works, farm laborers, and possibly domestic servants.

We have congratulated ourselves that, in South Africa, we have a country where English men, women, and children can thrive; that, on this account, it is of great value to us for future expansion; but we can never colonize a country in which home life is an impossibility for the majority. The Southern States in America would probably never have been colonized as they were unless there had been plenty of negro labor both in the plantations and for domestic service; Natal would never have been the prosperous country it now is, unless Indian labor had been im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ported; Cape Colony became a settled country with the aid of slaves, and is now carrying on under considerable difficulty with the inefficient and insufficient substitute of Kafir labor, raised to the economic level of possessing a vote for Members of Parliament.

A white man's country consists of an aggregation of white men's homes. It is not a matter of first-rate importance whether the farmer, the government official, the professional man, and the artisan buy their stores from an Indian or from a Scotsman; but it is certainly a vital necessity that they should be able to live in decency and comfort in proportion to their ability and their energy, that they should be able to marry and rear families, and that when their day's work is done they should be able to enjoy the comforts of a home, instead of facing the sordid discomfort of a house with no domestic service, and a wife worn out with the hopeless struggle of body and mind engendered by the never-ceasing difficulty of the servant question.

It has been well said, in connection with the opposition which was raised to the importation of Chinese, that it was their virtues and not their vices which rendered the Chinaman a terror to a certain section of the community; and so it is with regard to the importation or immigration of our Indian fellow subjects,—it is their trading ability, their industry, sobriety, and economy, their superiority in many instances in the general administration of their business, in regard to the housing of their employees and the sanitation of their dwellings, that causes the white storekeeper to look askance at them.

And who are these white storekeepers, and other white men, who are to dictate the terms on which the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony shall be occupied by men and women of British birth? They are representatives of nearly every European nationality, from the average middle-class Briton down to the lowest type of Syrian Jew! In fact, all the human waste of Europe may compete with the British storekeeper; but, as their ability is not so conspicuous, there is no legislation against them any more than there is in England, where they are actually driving our poorer classes to the wall. But the Indian! He is a competitor to be feared, and therefore he is opprobriously termed a "coolie." No matter what his caste or social status, he is not allowed to enter the "white man's" country, and if he is already

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there, he is relegated for trading and residence to a "location" set apart for him, where he cannot injure the trade of the white man.

Notwithstanding all this, the white man who owns property has not been averse to evicting a tenant of British nationality, in order to lease his premises at a higher rental to an Indian; but, as soon as this procedure is rendered impossible by legislation, he joins in the cry to keep the Indian out of the country.

What, then, is the outcome of all this cry for a "White South Africa"? It appears to result in the maintenance of a South Africa under a system of rigid protection in favor of the store-keepers and Kafirs; in truth, a black man's country, if ever there was one. And such a black man!

To those who know our Indian Empire, the Indian, with his ancient civilization, his superior brains and breeding, his qualities as a laborer, a servant, a tradesman, and a citizen, there can be no comparison either with the scum of Eastern Europe, or with the Kafir; and it must ever be a source of regret that the outcry of prejudiced and interested parties should have been able to bring about legislation which prevents the immigration of many useful classes of our Indian fellow subjects, who would materially assist us in the evolution of a "White Man's South Africa"; and reduces the social status of those already in the country to the level of the Kafir.

F. G. STONE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SAN DOMINGO QUESTION.

BY FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEVADA.

WHEN the President sent the Dominican treaty to the Senate for ratification, it was announced in the press that I could be relied upon as one of the few Democrats who would vote for its ratification, because of sympathy of view with the President as to our Pan-American policy.

The treaty itself was regarded as the practical exposition of the President's policy, first declared in a letter to the Cuban dinner as follows:

"Any country whose people conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendliness. If a nation shows that it knows how to act with decency in industrial and political matters; if it keeps order and pays its obligations, then it need fear no interference from the United States. Brutal wrong-doing, or impotence, which results in the general loosening of the ties of civilized society may finally require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the United States cannot ignore its duty."

I must say that, when this utterance was first published, it aroused my sympathetic interest. I recalled that in the Cuban debate of April 4th, 1896, while I was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I had expressed myself somewhat similarly in the House of Representatives, as follows:

"I take it that a great and powerful nation like the United States, the greatest and most powerful in this part of the world, has a certain duty to perform to other nations, just as every individual in our social organization has a duty to perform to other individuals. And this duty is the higher and stronger in proportion to the power and strength of the individual or nation. . . . I think this nation has some duty to perform, besides its duty to its own people. I think we have a duty to perform to all the republics of this continent, that now, with the exception of Mexico, cast disgrace upon the very name of republicanism. . . . It should be exercised through the Pan-American Congress, through

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treaty relations for mutual cooperation and support, by all the moral influence which a great nation can exercise in its communion with weaker powers, and, if necessary, when civil war, anarchy and mutual destruction blot the fair name of republic, and substitute military despotism, by an armed intervention commanding order and good government."

Had it not been for the experience intervening between the Cuban War and the San Domingo treaty, I would have been prompt to give my support to the latter; but, with that experience before me, I felt it necessary to proceed with caution and deliberation, as the treaty involved a new national policy. Our experiences in Cuba, the Philippines and Panama had convinced me that, however beneficent our purpose might be in the beginning, we were likely to be drifted, either by circumstance, self-interest or desire for military glory, into a policy which we would have repudiated at the start. In addition to this, the well-defined purpose of the President to secure a free hand in international affairs, by eliminating as far as possible the Senate as a factor in their determination, has led me to fear that, if we once entered on a policy of active intervention, we might become involved in such international perplexities as to drift us away from the domestic problems that concern us.

In the Cuban War, our purpose was not aggression, but pacification; and yet we drifted from the task of freeing Cuba to that of subjecting the Philippines to our dominion by force of arms. It matters not whether this was due to destiny, uncontrollable circumstances, commercialism or love of conquest. The fact remains that, though at the commencement of the Cuban War McKinley voiced the sentiment of the American people when he declared that forcible annexation was criminal aggression, we drifted into both.

So also, in Panama, years ago, we secured a right of way by treaty with New Granada, now Colombia, under which we recognized Colombia's right and sovereignty, and agreed to protect her title against the world. Later on, when Colombia disagreed with us as to the terms for a larger right of way—a ship-canal—including control over the Canal Zone, we refused to permit her to bargain as to the amount of compensation, and, availing ourselves of the fiction of a Panama uprising, we wrested the control of Panama from Colombia in the twinkling of an eye, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secured for ourselves sovereignty over the Canal Zone. The right of way represented by a railroad track eight feet wide was, by Executive decree, made many miles wide. Colombia, forbidden by our navy to land her troops on her own soil for the suppression of domestic disorder, was raped of her territory; and a contractual possession, held by us under Colombia's sovereignty, was forcibly enlarged into an absolute dominion and sovereignty, the suggestion of which would have been indignantly repudiated when our possession was acquired.

These experiences might well make the most ardent advocate of the moral duty of the United States hesitate regarding the innocent possession of the Dominican custom-houses, as a means of enabling San Domingo to settle with her creditors.

The views of the President regarding the Senate as a factor in the treaty-making power might well deter us from the acceptance of his policy. The purpose of the fathers was to keep our country out of foreign complications and consequent wars; and so they placed the war power in Congress, made the Senate a participator in the treaty-making power, and required the assent, not of a mere majority, but of two-thirds of the Senate. With a President and a Secretary of State both of whom are eager to make the United States a dominant factor in the world's affairs, it is easy to understand how both would chafe under the restraint of a deliberative body like the Senate. The result was a deliberate effort to escape or minimize this restraint. Under the general arbitration treaty it was sought, by the use of the term "agreement," to induce the Senate to contract away its treaty-making power and duty as to all future international arrangements within the scope of that treaty; and by the use of the term "protocol" in the place of "treaty," our State Department, without the consent of the Senate, executed and entered into the operation of an arbitral arrangement under which our Government took possession of San Domingo custom-houses, as security for the claim of the San Domingo Improvement Company. If it was necessary to submit to the Senate the pending treaty, which was also called a "protocol," it was also necessary to submit to the Senate the arbitral protocol; for, under both, the United States is to enter into a qualified possession of foreign territory which it may at any time require the use of force to maintain.

During the past eight years of continuous international ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, we have found the nation drifting into aggression, in strong contrast with the traditions of the Republic and the peaceful intentions of our people at the commencement of this new era. During these eight years, we have almost neglected domestic legislation. Whilst we have been engaged in conquering other countries, monopoly has conquered our own; and, under the leadership of a President whose policy upon all matters of domestic reform is meeting with such general approval, we are endeavoring to recover for our own people the ground which we have lost whilst our eyes have been strained towards the horizon of imperial grandeur.

No one will deny that the exigency to which the President has called our attention is a serious one, but it does not involve simply the ordinary exercise of the treaty-making power. It involves a new departure in our policy and active participation in the affairs of the Republics of South and Central America and of the Caribbean Sea—a protectorate over all of them which, in the end, may prove so absorbing as to draw our attention still further from the questions of domestic development and reform. Such a policy requires, not the secret consideration of the Senate, but thorough debate before, and consultation with, the entire people.

The evils which exist to-day in San Domingo exist in every South-American and Central-American republic. Almost all of them are embarrassed by foreign complications; almost all are being sapped by concessions to foreign countries which are oftentimes unwisely given and violently withdrawn. Almost all are dedicated to disorder and violence, instead of order and good government. All of them are under the protection of the Monroe Doctrine, declared by the United States, not as a matter of protection to them, but of defence to ourselves. Taking advantage of this, they repudiate their financial and honorable obligations, and oftentimes conduct themselves with a truculence that is most exasperating. As a matter of self-interest, therefore, the Monroe Doctrine compels us to protect these republics, whether they are right or wrong, and our moral position is not always a pleasant one.

In these matters San Domingo is typical. Revolution has followed revolution. Republican in name, the government is really a military despotism, where one dictator succeeds another, each possibly more cruel and more conscienceless than his prede-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cessor. Moneys are borrowed and bonds issued at enormous discounts. The bonds are floated, the interest defaulted, and foreign governments, urging the claims of their citizens, are met with the prevailing misrule and anarchy as a reason for non-payment. Concessions improvidently granted are withdrawn or interfered with, and claims arise out of these. European governments, accustomed as they have been of late to enforce the claims of their citizens against recalcitrant governments by peaceful blockades, by seizure of ports and territory, and by other methods, are deterred from doing so in this case by the Monroe Doctrine only. Outside of the Monroe Doctrine, armed intervention and the substitution of a government, however imperious, which would secure order, would be a blessing to San Domingo. European governments insist either that we should act in some such way as to settle these complications, or that we should permit them to act. Should we permit them to act, the peaceful blockade may end in war. The possession of a custom-house may end in the possession of the entire territory. The pecuniary claim may end in governmental possession and control.

It is true that, in this case, there is no suggestion of force or violence upon our part. Our intervention will be a peaceful intervention at the solicitation of San Domingo, and the purpose of it will be to secure for San Domingo an adjustment with her creditors, through the pledge of a part of her customs to be collected by an official of the United States, and distributed *pro rata* among the foreign creditors, including our own citizens. The proposed arrangement is a businesslike one, similar to that of an individual going through bankruptcy; a receiver is appointed who marshals the bankrupt's assets; claims are ascertained, and a *pro rata* division of the assets is made and an acquittance given. But here it is proposed that a government shall be the receiver; and what we fear is that, if the United States Government once obtains possession of any portion of San Domingo, our experience with the Philippines and Panama may be renewed.

And so the question of the desirability of San Domingo as an American acquisition comes up, and so also comes up the question as to the remaining islands in the Caribbean Sea, and what shall be our policy regarding them.

The American people have not looked with favor upon the ownership of these islands by European Powers. They command

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico and to the Panama Canal. In case of war, they can be fortified and can be made the basis of naval attack upon our coast. Were they without population, they would be exceedingly desirable, because of their salubrity of climate and richness of soil. Outside of the small islands belonging to France and England, there are three great islands, namely, Cuba, Hayti and Porto Rico, Hayti being under the possession of two so-called "republics," the Haytian and the San-Dominican. Porto Rico is ours. Cuba is under our protectorate. Jamaica is well governed by England; Hayti alone is in a condition of unrest. If San Domingo drifts into our hands, Hayti is likely to also, and this means the addition of over a million of blacks to our population. The race problem now before us is, surely, sufficiently difficult.

San Domingo, therefore, is undesirable; and we should be cautious in entering upon a policy which will ultimately make her a part of this country. We should take the whole country into our confidence and deliberate upon every phase of the question. There are three courses to pursue: One is to declare, as part of the Monroe Doctrine, that the United States will not recognize the unpaid contractual obligations of any American country as a cause for foreign intervention of any kind. This might mean the continuance and increase of the existing disorder and anarchy, in the governments to the south of us.

The second course would be for the Government of the United States to take the bold stand indicated by President Roosevelt, which would involve a declaration to all American republics that the United States would not tolerate any failure upon their part to respond to the duties of civilization; that, if they failed to pay their debts, they would be made to pay them, or if they failed to maintain order and good government they would be compelled to maintain them; and that the United States would, by an armed intervention, compel honesty, peace and good order, if necessary. Such a policy might mean constant annoyance, an increase of our military and naval force, an enlargement of our military expenditures, and the absorption of our Government in extraterritorial affairs, when its whole attention should be applied to the development of our own country and the reform of abuses at home.

The third course would be to recognize the right of the European nation whose citizens have claims against the governments

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of American countries, which the latter are unable through misrule and disorder, or are unwilling, through corruption and dishonesty, to meet, to move against such recalcitrant countries with all the force that is necessary to secure the payment of the claims, our government simply insisting that this force shall be only applied temporarily, and shall not result in the lasting possession of the territory of the recalcitrant nation or in the substitution of foreign for domestic government.

The danger in this policy is that it is not always easy to drop a possession once acquired, and that very many good reasons will be found for maintaining it; and that, in the end, we may have to use as much force in expelling the foreign government as would have been necessary originally in compelling the American country to respond to its obligations.

These are questions all involving the declaration of a new national policy upon the part of the United States, and it is of the highest importance that it should be carefully weighed and considered before action is taken. Such being my view, I urged that all the deliberations of the Senate upon the question of the San Domingo treaty should be in the open. It was not the ordinary case of treaty consideration, involving secrecy regarding the communications of and correspondence with a foreign government, but it involved a great national policy, which should be discussed in the open, the consideration of which should be shared by the people and the press, whose aid Congress should have in arriving at a final conclusion.

So far as this particular treaty was concerned, it involved the aggressive interference of the United States with the affairs of San Domingo. It was not framed simply upon a businesslike view of the insolvency of San Domingo; it expressly referred to the Monroe Doctrine as a reason for intervention. It bound the United States to take charge of the custom-houses of San Domingo and to apply fifty-five per cent. of the customs receipts to the payment of the debts of San Domingo. It bound the United States to attempt the adjustment of all the obligations of the Dominican Government, foreign as well as domestic; and it gave the United States a certain control over the tariff and port dues of the Dominican Government. It bound the Government of the United States, at the request of the Dominican Republic, to grant the latter "such other assistance as the former may deem proper

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to restore the credit, preserve the order, increase the efficiency of the civil administration, and advance the material progress and welfare of the Dominican Republic." It involved almost everything in the shape of control and government.

As stated in the President's message, "the conditions in the Republic of San Domingo have been growing steadily worse for many years. There have been many disturbances and revolutions, and debts have been contracted beyond the power of the Republic to pay. Some of these debts were properly contracted, . . . others are, without question, improper or exorbitant."

The message goes on to say: "One of the difficult and increasingly complicated problems which often arise in San Domingo grows out of the violation of contracts and concessions sometimes improvidently granted, and valuable privileges and exemptions granted often upon grossly inadequate considerations, which were burdensome to the state and which are not unfrequently disregarded and violated by the governing authorities." The best evidence of such improvident concessions is contained in the agreement made by Morales, the present Executive of San Domingo, with the Readers, by which, in consideration of their securing the treaty for the purpose of funding and taking care of the debt of San Domingo, he made the most reckless concessions of grants for railroads, for timber privileges, banks, etc. Each revolutionary leader is willing to burden the state with any obligation, however large, provided he can secure for immediate use a part of the consideration.

The present indebtedness of San Domingo, according to some statements, is thirty-two million dollars, and according to others twenty-four million dollars, of which about four million five hundred thousand dollars is due to the San Domingo Improvement Company, an American corporation; fourteen million dollars is due to foreign bondholders; four million dollars is due on internal claims; and the balance mainly consists of arrears of interest. San Domingo has about six hundred thousand people, and the total debt amounts to about forty dollars *per capita,* or about $200 upon the average family. Such an average upon the part of the United States would mean an indebtedness of over three billions of dollars.

It is clear from the history of this indebtedness that, although a large proportion of it has possibly been genuinely floated in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shape of bonds upon the investing public, a very small portion has been received by San Domingo; and San Domingo is practically in bankruptcy without the ability to pay, and without the ability to organize either a government or an economic system in such a way as to secure a compromise with its creditors, and the gradual payment of its debt. The compromise with creditors would mean nothing; for the creditors know from past experience that, after the payment of a few instalments has been made, even upon a small amount in compromise, default would take place owing to revolutionary conditions which follow each other in that island as one season follows another.

San Domingo, therefore, cannot herself compromise her debt. This task must be undertaken by some foreign government, or governments acting in unison. The security for the compromise, in the shape of customs duties, must be paid either under the control of a foreign government or under the control of some receiver satisfactory to the creditor nations, whose authority will be backed up if need be by force, and this force necessarily means the suppression of disorder and the maintenance of order by the dominating power of the creditor nation or nations.

The policy of the United States has been never to attempt to use force for the collection of the contractual claims of its citizens against foreign governments, or for the protection of the investments of American citizens in foreign countries. The contention of our State Department has always been that the American citizen who makes an investment in a foreign country surrenders his investment to the protection of that country, and cannot rely upon anything but the good offices of this country in an attempt to secure just treatment.

On the other hand, there are many European countries which apply force, particularly against weak Powers, for the enforcement of the contractual claims of their citizens, and this force sometimes means, not only the holding of ports and the collection of customs duties, but occasional seizure and permanent holding of the territory.

The seizure of Mexico by France, England and Spain was of this nature. England and Spain withdrew, leaving France alone in possession of Mexico. The United States applied the Monroe Doctrine and forced a withdrawal by France. Recently Germany, Italy and England made what they termed a "peace-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ful blockade" of a Venezuelan port. The presence of the armed forces of Europe in these ports was regarded with great apprehension by the American people, and popular excitement was averted only by the assurance that these great Powers had consulted our government before making the movement, and had given assurances that no occupation of territory was contemplated. Arbitration through The Hague Tribunal was accomplished through the friendly offices of our Government, but the result was a declaration of the principle of international law which practically negatives the whole purpose of The Hague Tribunal and puts a premium upon war. That Tribunal declared that Germany, Italy and England, through their display of force and blockade, had acquired a first lien upon the customs duties which were to be mortgaged for the payment of the award. The citizens of the United States who had claims against Venezuela were thus the victims of the tolerance and peacefulness of their Government; citizens of the belligerent Powers obtained a distinct advantage.

The difficulty then is this: If this country responds to the appeal of San Domingo to secure for her a composition with her creditors, to arrange the terms, to collect the revenues and to make the disbursements, it will doubtless be put in a position where it will be compelled to maintain order by its armed forces, and to practically govern the islands through its naval forces. If the Dominican people revolt against this, it will mean that we will have to suppress the insurrection by killing; if they yield to our control, it will probably mean that they will be so dependent upon our government that, when our task is ended, every reason of humanity and interest will be presented for our continuance in control, and thus the undertaking of a friendly task will involve us in the acquisition of a country containing a most undesirable population, whom it will not do to incorporate into our scheme of government, and whose government by our people will involve the enlargement of the Imperial idea and a still further abandonment of the old ideals of the Republic. If we do this in San Domingo, will we not be called upon to do it in Hayti, and, later on, in many of the South-American and Central-American republics; and, ultimately, will we not become so accustomed to the idea that we will be forcibly intervening for the purpose, not only of compelling the discharge of debts to foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creditors, but also of maintaining order and suppressing violence?

The magnitude of the task is appalling. Can such a task be undertaken save by an arbitrary government, in whose Executive are vested almost all the powers of sovereignty? Would not our government be overburdened with foreign problems, and would it not be impossible to consider the domestic problems which are likely to become more and more accentuated because of our complicated system of State and National government? The development of the Empire would then begin; the development of the Republic would then end. The development of the Empire means the control of other countries, inhabited by non-assimilable peoples. The development of the Republic means the expansion of our country from eighty to four hundred millions of a thoroughly homogeneous people, possessed of a domain rich in resources beyond the dreams of avarice, and governed by institutions which promise more for the happiness and prosperity of men than any other scheme of government ever devised.

But, it is said, it is impossible to permit San Domingo to drift as a derelict in the ocean; some creditor Power must control her, and if we do not control her foreign Powers will. This involves the assumption that, whatever Power takes possession of San Domingo, will take possession of it for all time, simply because of the inability of her people to govern themselves, and because dependence upon a foreign Power will drift them further and further away from self-government. Is, then, the only alternative to abandon the Monroe Doctrine and to admit that foreign Powers may take possession, either by treaty or by force, of San Domingo, with a view to securing the payment of San Domingo's indebtedness to the citizens of other countries, when we know that such possession cannot in the nature of things be temporary, but must be permanent?

It would be preferable for the American people to declare formally, under the Monroe Doctrine, that, whilst we have no disposition to protect American countries when they have done arbitrary wrong to foreign countries or their citizens, yet the redress sought must assume some other form than that of an occupation of territory, and that, in case of contractual claims, we would deny the right of foreign countries to use force against American countries for their collection.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But is there not some way in which San Domingo can be helped out of her difficulty? Why would it not do to have a Commission appointed, consisting of representatives from the creditor nations together with a representative of San Domingo? Let this Commission make a report to the respective governments, first, as to the amount which in justice and equity ought to be paid by San Domingo to each creditor, were she solvent; second, how much San Domingo can afford to pay without burdening the future of her people too severely; third, what percentage this would be upon the amount of the claims justly due; fourth, what security can be given by San Domingo involving the least governmental disturbance; fifth, the placing of such security, if it be in the shape of customs duties, under the control of a citizen of some disinterested Power, such as Switzerland, its control to be backed by such force as may be agreed upon by the creditor nations; all the nations stipulating that in no case would permanent territorial occupation be permitted. In other words, the proceedings might assume the form of proceedings against a defaulting corporation, resulting in the appointment of a receiver, an ascertainment of debts, gradual liquidation, and a final restoration of the property to the control of the corporation.

The difficulty about this would be that the American people have become so fixed in the view that the Monroe Doctrine absolutely prohibits foreign interference with American government and administration, that they may not tolerate the idea of foreign countries participating at all in such receivership. On the other hand, the only alternative is the acceptance of the receivership by the United States Government itself, and a receivership will undoubtedly mean in the end the permanent occupation and holding of San Domingo.

There is another view to be taken of San Domingo, which involves a comprehensive policy regarding all the islands in the Caribbean Sea. The United States now holds title to and possession of Porto Rico; it has a protectorate over Cuba which controls that island in its sanitary arrangements, in its debt-making capacity, and authorizes our government to intervene in case of domestic disorder and violence, threatening the stability of government. Between Porto Rico and Cuba is the island of Hayti, upon which two so-called republics, the Republic of Hayti and the Republic of San Domingo, exist. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could declare a policy regarding the islands of the Caribbean Sea that we would not apply to the case of Central and South America—the difference in policy being based upon the fact of their propinquity, their control of the Gulf, and their control of the approach to the Panama Canal? If we have the ownership of Porto Rico and a protectorate over Cuba, it would not be a long step to establish a protectorate over San Domingo, and possibly over Hayti, if the latter consent, or if domestic revolutions there make it necessary for us in self-interest to intervene. We could commence by incorporating into our treaty with San Domingo all the essential features of the Platt amendment to the Cuban Constitution, and add to the protectorate a right to maintain a resident minister, whose assent would have to be secured as to all measures affecting the debts, the sanitation and the good order of the country.

It might be possible, later on, to adjust the race question in this country by providing for the gradual colonization of the blacks in the United States on these islands, under humane conditions as to individual proprietorship of land and industrial development. Cuba has to-day only a population of a million and a half of people, and she is capable of supporting a population of fifteen millions. Would it not be to the advantage of both countries if Cuba could absorb our negro population? The population of this country would then be homogeneous, and the grave disaster likely to come to us from the juxtaposition of the two races would be averted. To-day, we have twelve million blacks out of a total population of eighty millions of people. With their large birth-rate, they are increasing in larger proportion than our own people. The only thing that keeps them back is their large death-rate, and that will diminish with education and civilization. The imminent danger to this country is that, as the black race becomes stronger in numbers, the prejudice against it will increase. The lines between the two races are becoming more and more distinct every day, and there is the danger, in the future, either of a race massacre or of the inferior race being subjected to a condition approaching slavery. A race war would prove as great a calamity as the Civil War, and the subjection of the negro would simply renew the conditions which prevailed before the war. The war then would have been fought in vain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prior to the emancipation of the blacks, philanthropists throughout the country, including Henry Clay, were urging the colonization of our negroes in Africa, and the Liberian colony was formed with that view, such a system involving great hardship and inhumanity. But distance itself made this impossible. Here we have in the Caribbean Sea islands of unsurpassed fertility of soil and richness of resource, admirably adapted to the black race. The expense of removal would be light. The ability to secure individual homes for each family would be within reach. The process of readjustment would have to be a gradual one, for the immediate segregation of the black labor of the South would cause industrial disturbances of serious consequences; but, if the colonization of the negro is possible, it could not be accomplished under more favorable conditions, and we could easily afford the expenditure if in the near future a policy could be inaugurated which would preserve this country for all time for the white race.

These are the perplexities that are involved in this simple project of a treaty with San Domingo—the treaty which is urged with the best of intention by a President who is intent upon doing things, and who likes to do them quickly; and whose sincerity and patriotism no one doubts. He has opened up a wide field of deliberation; and it is to be hoped that the matter will receive, as it deserves, the full, candid and non-partisan consideration of the American people, the study of all the problems directly or indirectly connected with it, and the adaptation of the action of to-day to a broad and comprehensive policy that will insure the race integrity of the United States and the perpetuity of the Republic.

Above all things, we should avoid "drifting," the adopting of temporary expedients to meet temporary emergencies. We should, through Committee investigation and Commission inquiry, get at all the facts, economic and governmental, and by open debate challenge the best thought of the country.

FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROPER GRADE OF DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION.—A REJOINDER.

BY JULIEN GORDON (MRS. VAN RENSSELAER CRUGER).

IN the May number of this REVIEW, Mr. James F. Barnett replied to an article of mine which appeared in the January number under the title, "A Proper Grade of Diplomatic Representation." In opening his reply, Mr. Barnett said:

"Mrs. Cruger's remedy would be to provide official residences for our diplomatic representatives, 'in which all envoys, rich or poor, shall be expected to reside in a condition of quiet and unostentatious elegance consistent with republican institutions.' As a result, she thinks, the style of living would be approximately the same, whatever the personal means of the incumbent; and diplomatic life would, as of old, be open to the Irvings, Bancrofts, Motleys and Lowells of a later day.

"The ambassadorship was introduced into our foreign service by the Act of Congress of March 1st, 1893. This Act was passed at the very end of the last session of Congress under the Harrison administration. Coming, as it did, on the eve of a new Democratic régime, the measure seems to have been passed without discussion.

"Mr. Cleveland immediately availed himself of this authority by accrediting as ambassadors the new American representatives to England, France, Germany and Italy. No further additions were made to the number until Mr. McKinley's first administration, when, in December, 1898, our ministers to Mexico and Russia were accredited as ambassadors. In June, 1902, similar action was taken as to the legation to Austro-Hungary, and last year the Brazilian mission became an embassy. . . .

"The text of the Act of March 1st, 1893, is as follows: 'Whenever the President shall be advised that any foreign government is represented, or is about to be represented, in the United States by an ambassador, envoy extraordinary, minister plenipotentiary, minister resident, special envoy or *chargé d'affaires*, he is authorized, at his discretion, to direct that the representative of the United States to such government shall bear the same designation. This provision shall in no wise affect the duties, powers or salary of such representative.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Mrs. Cruger supposes that, 'whatever be the urgent need of this country for an envoy of ambassadorial rank, at a particular time or place, the President is powerless to take the initiative in appointing him. Not until the government to which he is to be accredited has actually taken the first step does the law in question become operative.'"

My excuse, if one be needed, for that supposition consists, first, of the fact that the statute in question so provides in express terms upon its face; second, of the fact that our Department of State has so construed it in the making of the appointments of every one of the eight ambassadors to whom Mr. Barnett has referred. He makes a strange mistake as to very recent historical facts when he says: "Mr. Cleveland immediately availed himself of this authority by accrediting as ambassadors the new American representatives to England, France, Germany and Italy." On the contrary, Mr. Cleveland did not take the initiative in appointing any one of the ambassadors to the countries named. Not until the government of each one of such countries had taken the first step did Mr. Cleveland respond, under the limitations of the statute, by appointing representatives of ambassadorial rank. Such is the history of every appointment of that class so far made. But to this Mr. Barnett may, no doubt, reply that Mr. Cleveland and his successors might have taken the initiative, if they had seen fit to assume that the act in question is unconstitutional and void, because in conflict with that clause of the Constitution which gives to the President the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls. That novel idea Mr. Barnett justifies by reference to a certain opinion given by Attorney-General Cushing to the Secretary of State, May 25th, 1855. He says:

"The point above alluded to was settled by an opinion of Attorney-General Cushing so long ago as 1855, when he ruled that an Act of Congress which provided that the President should appoint diplomatic representatives of a certain grade to certain countries was clearly unconstitutional. . . . In so far, therefore, as this law appears to limit the circumstances in which the President may appoint an ambassador, it is of no binding force whatever. At best, it is but an expression of opinion by the members of the Fifty-second Congress that the President should await the action of foreign governments before exercising this prerogative. To this extent the law is an anomaly, and *ought to be amended*, so that a diplomatic officer may be promoted whenever the President deems expedient."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every layman knows that, when a law "is of no binding force whatever," as Mr. Barnett says this one is, it is folly to amend it. Every layman should also know that the opinion of an Attorney-General as to the unconstitutionality of an act passed in 1855 is powerless to "settle" the validity or invalidity of a very dissimilar act passed in 1893. Whatever weight the opinion of Attorney-General Cushing might have in this controversy would depend, of course, upon the application of the principles defined by him to the terms of the present act. Mr. Barnett is obviously in error when he so construes it as to make it "*limit* the circumstances in which the President may appoint an ambassador." Upon the contrary, it is designed to enlarge his powers and to leave his discretion absolute. When the foreign government has taken the initiative, the President "is authorized, *at his discretion,* to direct that the representative of the United States to such government shall bear the same designation."

So far, Mr. Barnett has hit the mark only once, and that is when, admitting the validity of the act, he says that "the law is an anomaly, and ought to be amended." That was my original contention. I ventured to say that it was far more practicable to remove in that way the difficulties of which the Hon. John W. Foster had complained in the paper which I undertook to review in the first instance, than to attempt to induce all Europe to abandon its habits and traditions through the abolition of the immemorial grades of diplomatic representation. Mr. Barnett evidently concurs in that view when he says: "As Mrs. Cruger suggests, there seems to be little likelihood that European governments would agree to the levelling process in diplomatic rank proposed by Mr. Foster." Persons familiar with foreign courts know this.

As Mr. Barnett, who is a member of the Committee on International Law of the American Bar Association, has studied in the School of Political Science in Columbia University, I feel flattered to have him declare that:

"With Mrs. Cruger's plea for official residences for our diplomatic representatives, all reasonable-minded persons will be in hearty accord. In February, 1897, Mr. Olney, then Secretary of State, transmitted to Congress a report on this subject, based on information supplied by our representatives abroad. It will be interesting to recall some of the statistics then presented."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Barnett then gives a list of governments owning official residences at the several foreign capitals. That list, including Vienna, Brussels, Pekin, Paris, Berlin, The Hague, St. Petersburg, Madrid, Constantinople, Berne, London, Teheran and Rome, concludes with the humiliating statement that "the United States owns legation buildings only at Tokio, Seoul, Bangkok and Tangier." Mr. Barnett evidently thinks that the best way to fill the vacuum is through purchases, to be made gradually in the several capitals, at a total cost of at least two millions of dollars. The practical difficulty is that there is no reason to believe that Congress would listen to the suggestion, wise as such a step would certainly be. On December 2nd, 1895, President Cleveland, in his annual message, said to Congress:

"I am thoroughly convinced that, in addition to their salaries, our ambassadors and ministers at foreign courts should be provided by the government with official residences. The salaries of these officers are comparatively small and in most cases insufficient to pay, with other necessary expenses, the cost of maintaining household establishments in keeping with their important and delicate functions. The usefulness of a nation's diplomatic representative undeniably depends much upon the appropriateness of his surroundings, and a country like ours, while avoiding unnecessary glitter and show, should be certain that it does not suffer in its relations with foreign nations through parsimony and shabbiness in its diplomatic outfit. *These considerations and the other advantages of having fixed and somewhat permanent locations for our embassies would abundantly justify the moderate expenditure necessary to carry out the suggestion.*"

I happen to know that the plan then in contemplation, involving a "moderate expenditure," did not look to the purchase of residences, but to a leasing of them for terms of years, and to the furnishing of them at the expense of the Government. For the paltry sum of about eighty or a hundred thousand dollars a year, adequate residences could be leased in all the European capitals in which they are needed, and for about three hundred thousand dollars they could be decently furnished. If Congress, leaving the diplomatic salaries as they are, would only make an appropriation of that kind, the whole matter could be settled at once upon a basis which would represent a good beginning. No larger or better beginning can be hoped for in the present state of public opinion.

JULIEN GORDON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRAFFIC IN SPURIOUS PICTURES.—A WARNING TO THE AMERICAN COLLECTOR.

BY A PARIS AUTHORITY.

"At the request of several auctioneers, and on the warrant of a *Juge d'Instruction*, a Commissary of Police in the Faubourg Montmartre quarter visited the sale-rooms of the Hôtel Drouot this week and seized numerous 'faked' pictures bearing the signatures of Boudin, Corot, Courbet, Harpignies, and Jongkind."—*Special Paris Cablegram to a New York Newspaper.*

WITH what astonishment must the American public—and especially American picture-buyers—have read the above cablegram, a few weeks ago, in their morning newspaper! "What?" I can imagine some millionaire connoisseur exclaiming, as he recollects that, on his last visit to Paris, he bought a number of modern pictures at this very Hôtel Drouot. "What? Purchasers are not protected against fraud in these official sale-rooms? In spite of official experts and ministerial officers empowered with enormous authority, and receiving still more enormous salaries, spurious pictures may be put up for auction and, but for the opportune appearance of a Police Commissary, may be sold as genuine works of art? I wonder if the Millet I bought there last spring is really by the master!" Such a state of things is, indeed, surprising to any one who is not behind the scenes, who is unacquainted with the shady side of the Paris picture trade. And as few wealthy American connoisseurs *are* acquainted with it, I shall endeavor in this article to open their eyes to some of the dangers with which they are threatened when they add to their galleries from the Parisian picture-market.

New though this subject will be to the people of the United States, it is a very old one to Parisians. The articles which have been written against the present vicious system would, if collected together, form many volumes. Some of them, as those which ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peared in the "*Gazette des Beaux-Arts*" about 1860, date back nearly half a century. Yet, for all that, nothing has changed; nay, the trade in spurious pictures, not to mention that in spurious works of art in general, is carried on on a larger scale than ever before. Never have the fraudulent practices of picture-dealers and "experts" been so barefaced as during the last few years.

One of the principal reasons why "faked" pictures continue to be sold at the Hôtel Drouot (and, consequently, at the dealers', for, once a picture has been sold there as genuine, it passes into circulation as such) is the well-known ignorance of the auctioneers. What are the necessary qualifications for exercising this calling? None whatever, except a sum of money large enough to purchase a post. A Paris auctioneer need have no artistic knowledge. "But," some one may say, "does he not acquire it after a few years' practice?" Possibly; but how many years will it be, presuming he possesses an aptitude for judging pictures, before he gains experience, and, meanwhile, how many "fakes" pass through his hands and are sold as genuine? "But is he not assisted by an expert?" some one else remarks. That is quite true. But what an expert! I imagine that magic word, which has so long opened all doors and enabled swindle after swindle to be committed officially with impunity, has lost a good deal of its glamour.

The expert in a Paris picture sale has no responsibility whatever. Yet he it is who presides over the sale, who draws up the catalogue in any manner he thinks fit, and who packs the sale-room with his friends and accomplices, with whom he is frequently agreed as to the opportune moment of putting up this or that work of art. The interests of the venders, and these are often widows or minors, are entirely in his hands, and, if he is so disposed, he can sacrifice them without fear of anything worse than reproach. On the occasion of a recent sale at the Hôtel Drouot, a certain expert, who, as is frequently the case, is also a dealer, placed a value of 150 francs upon a picture. One of the spectators, recognizing that the canvas was a good one and worth much more than the price placed upon it, bid again and again. The expert was also very anxious to have the picture, so much so, in fact, that he bid up to the sum of 1,200 francs before securing it. No sooner had the picture been knocked down to him at this price, than a well-known Parisian art critic rose and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reproached the expert with offering 1,200 francs for a work which he had valued at only 150 francs. It more frequently happens, however, that the "expert" is distinguished for his crass ignorance. The author of one of the articles already referred to, touching upon this very point, wrote:

"I accuse no particular person. I simply refer to the body of Parisian experts in general. What is the meaning of this title 'expert'? I am in absolute ignorance as to what examination they have passed, or as to the jury from whom they have received their diplomas. . . . I am astonished that, in a country where one so often encounters instances of the jealous supervision of the government, guarantees, both intellectual and monetary, are not required from those who are intrusted with such delicate duties. I am, above all, astonished that those ministerial officers, the auctioneers, have not been the first to point out this omission from the laws in regard to a body of men who daily act as intermediaries between them and the public. How is it that collectors do not more often protest against false attributions and, in addition to that, claim for the losses which they occasion?"

The Parisian picture expert need, in fact, have received no instruction whatever in art, and, as sometimes has happened, he may formerly have carried on the business of a hair-dresser! Or he may have been a commercial traveller, a wardrobe-dealer, or a vender of photographs. All that it is necessary for him to do is to learn by heart a number of art terms in current use, and place the word "expert" over the door of his shop. How can one expect such a man as this to distinguish spurious from genuine works of art, when even a painter himself is often at a loss to say whether or not a certain picture is really from his brush? The case of the great animal-painter, Charles Jacque, contesting the authenticity of one of his early and rather important pictures at a sale conducted by M. Charles Pillet, will be fresh in the memory of every one who has read the biography of that master of the 1830 school. Jacque recognized his error, after a more attentive examination than he had at first given to the work; but he would probably never have done so but for the chance presence at the sale of one of his former pupils, Maître Boussaton, who, distinctly recollecting the time at which the picture had been painted, begged him to make a final call on his memory.

Notwithstanding the little real value which is to be attached to the word "expert" or "*expert près les tribunaux*" which one sees over the doors of many Parisian picture-dealers, it is surpris-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing what confidence it inspires, and how infallibly it attracts or retains customers. The possession of this magic title enables a dealer to deliver judgment on all questions appertaining to art, and without fear of contradiction. Picture-buyers place implicit faith in his dicta, pay him handsomely and are content.

Not very long ago, a gentleman, whom I shall call A——, had two pictures by Manet for sale. They had been bought from Madame Manet, on the death of her husband, and are recorded in the catalogue of the painter's works drawn up by M. Duret, so cannot be regarded as otherwise than authentic. Placed in relations with an American connoisseur, A—— showed him the pictures, and as these were found quite satisfactory a bargain was concluded. It was agreed that the canvases should be delivered at the connoisseur's hotel within twenty-four hours, the bill being paid on presentation of the works. On leaving A——'s house, however, the American, who was accompanied by a friend, possibly an adviser, thought he would call upon a certain expert and picture-dealer, whom we will label B——, to distinguish him from the vender. In the course of conversation, the purchase of the Manets was mentioned, whereupon B—— instantly declared that he knew the pictures were forgeries. Great was the American's surprise, and, as he placed a good deal of confidence in the expert's knowledge, he at once decided he would inform A—— that he had changed his mind. Astounded in his turn, A—— began to make inquiries as to the reason for this sudden change; and finding, after a lapse of several weeks, that B—— was at the bottom of the mischief, he determined the expert should see the pictures. Face to face with the two Manets, the dealer declared that he was "quite unaware of their existence" and that they were undoubtedly genuine. "How is it, then," he was asked, "that you declared they were forgeries?" "You are mistaken," was the reply; "it was not I, but my sons who said that." B——'s sons, being also invited to inspect the works, likewise declared they were genuine, and this is the excuse which the father, speaking to one of his friends, a few days afterwards, made in their defence: "My sons' reply was, after all, quite natural. Picture-dealers, possessing a large selection of works of art, including pictures by Manet, cannot undertake to assist others to sell their property!"

Why picture-collectors, who generally possess infinitely greater

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge of pictures than their experts, should place such faith in the verdicts of these people is one of the little mysteries of human nature. I suppose it arises from a desire on the collector's part to escape all responsibility. If an error has been committed, he can blame his expert; if he has paid too dear for a picture, he can tell his friends that it was the expert's fault; or, if he has missed the chance of getting hold of "a good thing," he can still find fault with his expert's judgment.

A few days before writing this article, I came across the following paragraph in a Paris morning newspaper:

"Do our readers know that there exists in Paris a manufactory in which artists, receiving large salaries, copy the canvases of the great masters? These pictures are sent to the United States, a high duty is paid upon them, and, being thus stamped as authentic, they are then sold for their weight in gold to American millionaires. In the gallery of one of these collectors can be seen quite a number of pictures the originals of which are either in Paris or in the provinces."

But one alteration need be made to these words: the writer should have said "a number of manufactories," for they simply swarm in the Montmartre and Montparnasse quarters, without counting those which are in the suburbs and provinces. Some are attached to this or that dealer-expert, whilst others undertake to supply the "trade" in general. As the same picture is copied several times—generally, however, with variations,—these copyists no longer have need of an original; a simple copy is all that is necessary. There you have the explanation for there being so many spurious Charles Jacques, Henners, and Ziems on the market. And, no sooner has an artist attained a reputation, than immediately an army of forgers set to work to imitate him.

In the case of Ziem, whose works are imitated on a larger scale than those of any other living artist,—and mentioning his name reminds me that Jules Claretie, of the French Academy, recently related in the "*Temps*" that the painter once refunded to a lady a large sum of money which she had paid for several spurious works bearing his signature,—in the case of Ziem, one has only to compare his (alleged) canvases in the shop-windows of certain large dealers with those at other dealers' to see that they represent a variety of manners and notes, which can only be explained by the fact that each imitator has put something of his own style of painting into his copies of the master's Venetian scenes. Fraud

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is carried on to such an extent that the forger no longer waits for an artist's death. Not many months ago a consignment of twenty-nine pictures, all of them copies of works by three living artists, was seized at one of the ports just as they were about to be taken over to the United States.

Twenty years ago, when pictures of the 1830 school were all the rage, thousands of copies of canvases by Corot, Diaz, Dupré, Daubigny, Théodore Rousseau, Troyon and others were sent in that way to America. Dealers had in their employment a small army of imitators of those great painters. These *pasticheurs* worked, some, near Fontainebleau, others, in the neighborhood of Cernay, every week bringing in their work, signed, of course, with famous names. All the canvases by pupils of Corot, Diaz, and the others—men who had worked more or less in the style of their masters—which could be found were collected and re-signed. How is it that nowadays so few pictures by Villers and Mazon can be found? The many works which those excellent painters produced have not been destroyed. No; they have not been thrown away as worthless, because of the greater renown of Millet and Corot; they are hanging at this very moment in the galleries of great collectors, but baptized with other names than those of the men who painted them!

Here is another instance of what used to be done about the year 1880. A certain dealer in Paris bought one picture by each of the following painters: Corot, Daubigny, Diaz and Théodore Rousseau. Engaging a clever copyist at a salary of 1,000 francs a month, and providing him with a house and garden in the country, he set him to work to copy each picture twenty-five times, slightly varying the subject in each case. The hundred copies were produced in ten months, during which time, according to agreement, the painter saw no one save his servant. All these copies were sent to the United States and sold as originals from the collections of this or that well-known Parisian.

Very much the same thing is done nowadays in the case of eighteenth-century pictures. As in 1880, huge fortunes are being made by dealers who, ten years ago, were unknown in the picture trade. In forging old pictures, generally portraits, not only the copyist, but the painter-restorer, plays a part. The way in which the latter proceeds about his work will be seen from what follows.

A dealer collects together a number of pictures by one or other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the numerous old masters whose works are not in vogue—if possible, pictures by a painter who worked somewhat in the style of this or that famous artist; and from these, by means of skilful retouching, the painter-restorer produces works which are signed Rembrandt, Ruysdael, Hobbema, Raphael, Boucher, or Watteau. Placed in the shops of dealers who are supposed to be honest, these canvases find a ready market among wealthy collectors, who almost invariably trust another person's opinion in preference to their own. In the case of portraits and pictures containing figures, such as those by Largillière, which, like Nattier's works, are just now rising in value, a similar method is adopted, only care is taken to select pictures the light parts of which are uninjured and as near as possible in the style of the master whose work is to be imitated. With the assistance of good engravings, the drawing is slightly altered; half-tones and shadows are added; and, by means of glazes, the necessary piquancy and effect are produced. Naturally, canvases of the correct period, and genuine old stretchers—or panels, in the case of painters who usually painted on wood—are selected. Thus, a worthless portrait of, say, an old woman is turned into a picture of a pretty, bright-eyed damsel, which, under the name of either Nattier or Largillière, will "embellish" the gallery of some transatlantic connoisseur.

The patina and cracks of old pictures require very skilful imitating. Some picture-forgers use saffron, bister, liquorice or black coffee, which have now replaced bacon rind, so much used in former years. When this has been applied and is quite dry, the picture is varnished. Sometimes thick oil is added to the varnish, or it is colored with bitumen, yellow lac and red ochre, which give almost exactly the tone of old varnish.

Lest some of my readers may be inclined to think that I have exaggerated the dangers which the unwary American collector runs in placing his interests entirely in the hands of certain Parisian dealer-experts, let me here state that many of my facts have been obtained from a well-known French collector who, on more than one occasion, has detected the numerous tricks to which these unscrupulous tradesmen resort. My thanks are due to him, not only for the invaluable fruit of his experience, but also for his kindness in placing his library, and above all his annotated catalogues, numbering some 20,000, at my disposal,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

catalogues which, he tells me, have often saved him from purchasing spurious pictures. He said:

"When a picture is offered to me, I at once refer to the catalogue of the collection from which it is said to have come, and find out for myself if that is really so. I have frequently discovered, thanks to the indications as to prices, etc., written in my catalogues, that pictures or other works of art have been withdrawn as forgeries or doubtful. Once I found that the picture offered me—it was a Watteau, said to have come from the Morny Sale, and it was afterwards sold as such to a rich American—was another work altogether. But look for yourself and you will see that the Duc de Morny's Watteau was bought by the Marquess of Hertford, and, as every one now knows, it figures to-day in the Wallace Gallery in London. Had your compatriot but possessed this annotated catalogue he would have saved I don't know how many thousand dollars."

On my remarking that it must not be easy to get together so precious a collection of documents, my friend continued as follows:

"No; it is not easy unless you possess ample means. But what is a sum of ten or twelve thousand dollars to one of your American millionaires? And for much less than that a connoisseur could form a similar collection of catalogues to my own; he has only to apply to the same quarter . . . . and he can obtain annotated duplicates. I have not the slightest doubt that, as in my own case, he will find the investment is a good one."

This French connoisseur's superb collection of catalogues has come from various sources, the autograph annotations being by such celebrated experts and art critics as Paillet, Regnault Delalande, Duclos, Thore Burger, Philippe Burty, and Eugène Piot. The names of these men are alone a guarantee of the accuracy of the information which they have handed down for the benefit of future critics and collectors. Here are a few instances of the valuable data which these catalogues contain:

"1868. Collection of his Excellency Khalif-Bey, containing many first-class pictures. Two Fromentins were declared at the sale to be mere copies."

"1869. Collection of Koucheleff Besborodko, containing pictures by Dutch and Flemish masters. Several were pronounced forgeries, including one Albert Cuyp, one Rembrandt, etc."

"1870. Collection of San Donato. Most of the Creuzes were copies. Three Paul Delaroches were likewise forgeries. Yet, in spite of the fact that they were known by critics and experts to have been the work of a painter named Berenger, they were sold as originals at high prices."

"1876. Schneider Collection. Two Rembrandts were sold as doubtful."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"1899. Collection of Comte Doria. Amongst many fine examples of the 1830 School, quite a number of forgeries were put up for auction at this sale. They were, however, withdrawn, or at least some of them."

"1899. Collection of Madame Richard, *née* Bournet Aubertot. A Nattier, although declared to be a forgery by many well-known judges who were present at the sale, was sold for 49,500 francs."

"1900. Guasco Sale. At this sale a Troyon was falsely ascribed as having been in the collection of the painter. Moreover, it bore the stamp of the Troyon sale."

"1900. Rey Sale. A Raphael was sold, but the description in the catalogue is not that of the work put up for auction; it applies to quite another (genuine) work."

Now, let me ask American connoisseurs if they really think that the above-named forgeries are not still in existence. Their reply can only be: "Certainly, they are still on the market." Depend upon it, many of these pictures are in great collections in France, England and the United States; and from time to time, at the death of their owners, they are once more sold as originals. Some are still in the hands of unscrupulous dealer-experts, who, on offering them to collectors, produce catalogues (un-annotated, you may be sure) of the famous sales at which they were sold, or withdrawn. I would that some public library in the United States possessed, for the protection of American picture-lovers, such a collection of catalogues as that owned by my obliging friend.

I am fully aware that, in revealing the fraudulent tricks of picture-dealers, I shall have deeply wounded their *amour-propre*. But, by opening the eyes of American collectors, I shall have done service, not only to them, but to those dealers who have for years past regarded honesty as the best policy. The interests of a number of unscrupulous *marchands-experts* should not be allowed to interfere with those of honest members of the trade.

A PARIS AUTHORITY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN OPEN *VERSUS* A CLOSED SHOP.

BY JOHN BASCOM, LECTURER ON SOCIOLOGY IN WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

AN "open" as opposed to a "closed" shop is a phrase which has caught the ear of managers and created a sudden flurry in the labor-movement. It casts a deceptive light on the controversy between labor and capital. Without in any way altering the claims of the two parties, it creates a passing impression in favor of one of them. An open shop suggests liberty and a closed shop tyranny. Yet an open shop can only mean one in which those who enter and those who leave do so at the suggestion of the employer. Its freedom is the freedom of the man who keeps it. The closed shop suggests the absolute control of union men; yet the government of union men is constantly pushing toward methods whose defence rests on the interests of the entire working class, and on the reconciliation of those interests with the interests of the community at large. The liberty contemplated is the fullest liberty possible. The words, "an open *versus* a closed shop," give a factitious coloring to the entire question. If we substitute for them the far more descriptive phrase, "an unorganized as opposed to an organized shop," the illusion disappears, and we are thrown back on the old problem.

The labor-movement stands for an immense social gain. That the laboring class, which has long suffered social depression and been without any adequate protection against extreme pressure, should make a well-advised and patient effort for their own relief is a fact of first importance in human history. The partial success of this movement in England, during a century of hard struggle, settles it as a force which must henceforward be dealt with as an established tendency. Indeed, it is becoming an accepted truism with employers that trade-unions are well enough, only their particular action at a given time is ill-advised.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have reached a period, and the sooner we recognize the fact the better, in which the questions that lie between management and labor call for careful consideration and a settlement of the principles involved in them. This is a demand in the interest of both parties. Neither of them alone is in a condition to understand or to settle their respective claims. The phrase, "an open *versus* a closed shop," tends still farther to confuse the controversy and postpone its adjustment.

This adjustment is of vital interest to the parties to it and to the entire community. The losses, errors and vexations which attend on the formation of new social relations are of small importance compared with the gains that go with them. That labor and management should be put on more harmonious terms with each other, and that this advance is delayed by the hostility of so many managers to trade-unions, are facts that stand plainly out in the present disturbed relations.

A fundamental reconciliation called for is involved in the words "an open and a closed shop." Who are the parties whose interests are to be adjusted in organizing production? Besides the combinations on either side between employees and between employers, there are other workmen and other managers who cling to individual liberty, and prefer to remain as long as possible on the basis of personal adjustments. This class among workmen are favored by employers and played off against the unions. They thus come to be cordially disliked by the unions and are pushed aside as having no standing in the controversy. The open shop of the employer gives to this class the upper hand. The closed shop of the unions denies them all footing. Till this question between unions and non-union men is settled, there is sure to be aggression, and so violence, on either hand. The offer of a non-unionist to take the place of a unionist is regarded by the latter as intermeddling; and it is so far antagonistic as to render nugatory the primary idea of the union—a collective bargain. There is an hostility between these two attitudes which can only be overcome by finding some just method of reconciliation. This calls for dispassionate consideration by all the parties to the strife, both those who would cling to the old ways and those who would replace them by new ones. The underlying principle which must harmonize these conflicting tendencies, is the public welfare.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the steel industry, a bold, determined man, who had fallen out with the unions, made it his business to organize poorer workmen, and by their aid to "break" the strikes of the unions. In doing this, he showed much ability and courage; yet his action is to be judged, not by these qualities, but by the relation it bore to the welfare of the class to which he belonged. The rightfulness of action between men and between classes is determined by its relation to progress. He who opposes social development does so at his peril. A minority, in pursuit of the public welfare, has more claims on public support than a majority opposed to it. Such a minority, if successful, will increase the sum of liberty; while the majority, by prevailing, will reduce it. All personal freedom which is not obviously inimical to progress is to be watched over; and here lies the solution of the question between unions and non-union men. Both theory and experience attach a high value to unions, yet the union cannot be forced at once on all workmen. The right of personal liberty remains, till it begins to be manifestly opposed to joint action. There is thus at this point a constant change of claims, and a growing rightfulness in unions as they reach the foreground. It is time that the rights of these two classes of workmen were both recognized, and held in an amicable form. The hostility between labor and management prevents this. Management espouses the defence of the independent workman, and pushes his claims in a way that renders null the labor of the unions. The non-union man is thus made to block the growth of an entire class.

The present strife between labor and capital embarrasses every question of rightfulness between the two parties to production, and prevents any just apprehension of the differences which divide them. The measures suitable to war are not those fitted to peace. Let laborers and managers address themselves to the question, What are the relations best fitted to promote the general welfare? Difficulties would then begin at once to give way and would shortly disappear. Managers, by the eagerness with which they insist on retaining power and excluding counsel, foment the strife which blinds both parties to the sense of rightfulness. Peace would awaken new feelings, open up another set of considerations, and greatly widen knowledge.

Many of the faults met with in the unions, and bitterly complained of by employers, find their explanation in the senti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments incident to a state of war. Measures in themselves wrong commend themselves to workmen because they are weapons—only too few—in carrying on a strife in which the workmen are often taken at disadvantage and hard pressed. They are ready to neglect claims and inflict injuries, because they are fighting for existence. They cannot afford to wage war gingerly. Let the unions be once honestly recognized, and their members would be prepared to consider those questions involved in the common prosperity. Workmen have not been desirous of a corporate existence, because they feared the legal liabilities attached to it. They were stripped for the fight and wished no new incumbrances. Give them the sense of fair dealing, and this feeling would pass away. The contest is already too unequal to be farther burdened, as things now are.

Workmen are complained of as needlessly limiting production, and, when its conditions are already critical, of still farther embarrassing them by new claims. Managers herein forget that they create the circumstances under which methods take on the form of war measures. In war, we do not wait for the enemy to get ready; we strike as best we can and when we can. Oftentimes, the manager has been so long forgetful of the rights of the workman that he is surprised, grieved, angered to find them spring up like serpents in his path. Let us have peace and deliberation, and our notions will alter as to what is wise. The larger the output, the more successful the enterprise, the better for the workman, if the division of returns is acceptable, if the prosperity achieved is the common prosperity. We have not to go far to understand the satisfaction which one feels in impeding the production of those who unscrupulously appropriate the fruits of his labor. There is much simplicity in the censure of the manager who finds fault with workmen for lack of interest in their work, when he has given little attention to their claims. A first step toward a mutual understanding is consultation; strife only perverts the thoughts more and more.

Trade-unions are censured for putting superior labor on the same footing with inferior labor. The incentives and rewards of enterprise are thus greatly reduced. It is not easy to determine how the motives to industry can be fully retained in connection with restraints on the hours of labor and on overwork. This is a phase of the labor question which can only be arranged by careful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deliberation, and by the conviction that the methods accepted will be employed in good faith, and not bent to a personal end. It is certainly not more for the interest of workmen than it is for the interest of managers, that distinctions in the quality of labor should be overlooked. Each has a right to demand that the differences between laborers in efficiency shall not be lost sight of, and shall not be used as a means of reducing wages. Give us quiet consultation, and we may be able, at least in part, to reconcile the claims of the weak and the strong. The inferior are not to be used to settle the pay of the superior, nor are the superior to be compelled to reduce their labor to the standard of the inferior. Both policy and good-will may now impel the union to shelter the poorest workmen, lest these workmen should be left ready to break down its efforts for improved wages.

A kindred discussion has arisen in connection with apprentices. The number to be admitted to any department of labor is not a question to be pulled hither and thither, as the interests of contending parties may prompt. Managers, wishing sharp competition among laborers, may prefer a good supply of apprentices; and trained workmen may desire to keep the number down. The community at large has also a direct interest in the question. Any unnecessary restriction as to the pursuit of any occupation narrows the general choice, and tends to congestion in the less favored forms of labor. The community cannot advantageously allow labor and capital, even when agreed, to limit production and raise prices by a reduction of employment. A delicate question of this sort properly comes under principles of liberty applicable to the community at large.

The narrow and personal character now given to the contention between labor and management indisposes both parties to arbitration. When managers affirm that they have nothing to arbitrate, they usually mean that they are so confident of their own power that they do not care to run any risk by arbitration. Workmen are generally more disposed to arbitration, as being less able to bear the delays and risks of strife. Yet workmen may hesitate, so keenly aware are they of the interested and unsympathetic feeling which pervades the community at large. They have a strong undercurrent of custom, conventional sentiment and interest to confront.

The desirability of a judicial tribunal, such as is found in New

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Zealand, becomes manifest, when we confront conditions so unfavorable to sound counsel and speedy action as those which prevail with us. A tribunal should be always open whose office it should be to adjust the claims of both parties to each other, to watch over the interests of the entire community, and to carry events forward in the wisest practicable way. The decisions of such a tribunal should cover all interests and define all obligations, both those of the unions and those of laborers outside of the unions.

Under this system, principles begin at once to be established, experience is accumulated, errors are corrected, and the feelings of all classes begin to shape themselves to new conditions. Discussions bearing on the general welfare take the place of passion and personal prejudices. A new development sets in, and, as strife ceases, good-will comes to prevail. If we have any faith in human counsel, here is an opportunity for its wide application. The magnitude of the interests which would be affected by it in this country may be a reason for delay, but certainly not for blind disregard. We may well claim that the firm footing of the unions should at once be recognized, and action be suited to them with as much breadth and deliberation as are possible.

JOHN BASCOM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARTHUR, GUINEVERE AND LANCELOT.—AN OPEN LETTER TO MISS JULIA MAGRUDER.

BY JULIET EVERTS ROBB.

DEAR MADAM:

Is this paper of yours, called "Lancelot, Guinevere and Arthur,"* meant to be an argument for so-called "free-love"?

After a first reading, one is impressed with your championship of those lovers, in the poems you criticise, whose relation is illegal. Lancelot, "the flower of bravery," and Guinevere, "made for the love and worship of men," conceive for each other "the supreme love of both their lives," at a time when the lady is promised, but not bound, in marriage. Her vow to Arthur is made, however, and, together with Lancelot's oath of fealty and friendship to the King, stands between them. Still, they seek each other's arms. Guinevere's course is not to be wondered at, you think, because Lancelot "shows continually before the Queen such qualities of mind and graces of spirit . . . as furnish a reasonable and honorable foundation for the sentiment already kindled in her heart," and because "Arthur bored her." Lancelot is justified because she was his *only* mistress. He must not be held a smaller soul than Arthur simply because "he had not the chastity which consists in fidelity to the legal bond." To Lancelot, Guinevere "is bound by every tie of natural instinct, spiritual selection, intellectual judgment . . . the heart's affection based upon the mind's approval." Between her and Arthur "there is but the legal bond," you say; and for the "moralist's" dictum that this fervent and romantic passion, made unlawful by the woman's marriage with another man, should have stopped short of fulfilment, you have nothing stronger than "perhaps."

But there are expressions of respect for this secondary thing,

* NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, March, 1905.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this marriage. In our preoccupation with your earnest advocacy of the claims of love, we may have given these expressions less than due attention. We reread the article.

The marriage ceremony, you state, is "designed to operate for the good of the state, in the legitimizing of children and the inheritance of property." The strongest argument for it is "that of necessity." "The law *must* hold a man and woman together, because love will not." The legal bond we must respect, you are sure—but not the legal bond without love. But you have just asserted that love fails to hold husband and wife together, and, *therefore,* the legal bond *must* hold them. They must be held; they must not be held unless in love; and yet we cannot expect that love will last. I fail to follow this reasoning. 'Tis too hard a knot for me to untie.

Into the "Idyls of the King" you read—I must put it so, because I cannot for a moment concede that Tennyson wrote it there: the reason why the conclusions you cite have "passed unchallenged so long" is that no one but yourself ever saw them in the poems—into the Idyls you read the teaching that the mere ceremony of marriage is all in all, the sentiment of affection unimportant, and that the legal bond will endure in the life to come. Against this manifestly absurd doctrine you protest, declaring that such an ideal should not prevail with the men and women of to-day.

Nowhere in your paper do I find a clear and logical statement of the ideal you think should prevail. Love might be, you think, the all-sufficient tie between husband and wife, if only love were enduring; but love is notoriously changeable; it will not bind with any dependableness—hence, the necessity of a legal bond for the legitimizing of children, etc. The one statement which you emphasize, with "must" in italics, is this one, that it is needful to hold husband and wife together: that is, if there be love between them. So we go around and around in bewildering circles.

Are you trying to say that marriage should never be *entered upon* without mutual love? Surely, all would second you here. But what you really say is, that the legal bond without love is not to be respected. Do you mean without mutual love, or without any smallest minimum of love? Would love on one side outweigh indifference on the other, and make the bond respect-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able; or should the slightest wavering of one heart vitiate the whole contract? "Love is impermanent." Even if the union have been the result of mutual attraction, there may come a time when the love of one or other party may cease or wander, and fix itself upon a new object. What then?

Suppose that the love of the deserted one continue and even intensify—as, alas! so often happens—which love, the new or the old, has the better claim; and if the wounding of the unwedded love be cruel, what of the injury to the faithful married love? Probably you would answer that to remain in wedlock with love unrequited would be greater suffering than separation. The marriage should then be broken if only one withdraw allegiance. Is not this making love, which you say is an unreliable bond, the only bond, while yet you maintain that there must be a bond, and that it must be respected? Here is a tangle of inconsistency!

Just what do you mean by "respecting the marriage bond"? The only conclusion I can reach through your expressions is that you think the contract between man and wife should still be legally valid, even if neither love the other, but only legally; for, love being "itself its best excuse" and the supreme motive, each may follow the promptings of the heart even if they lead to unauthorized embraces.

Tennyson's prejudice in favor of Arthur you think unwarranted and antiquated. What would you have had him say of the spotless King, his wedded wife and her chaste paramour that would have made his teaching more reasonable and "up to date"? He could not vary the story of the events of their lives; he sought only to give a poetical version of time-honored traditions. A twentieth-century historical novelist, of course, would have "changed all that" without hesitation; but Tennyson was a poet.

You do not express the opinion that he should have made Arthur divorce Guinevere and let her marry Lancelot, but only that less praise should be meted to the King, less blame to the interesting lovers. You censure the poet for treating love as an unessential, a negligible quantity, in the marriage relation.

Tennyson not a worshipper of love! Read again, and read more widely! Tennyson could not have written "Laus Veneris"; but he wrote "Maud" and "Locksley Hall" and "The Princess" and "The Day Dream" and "Sir Lancelot and Queen Guinevere," and the other idyls besides the two from which you quote.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One could make a volume of love-lines from Tennyson. He knew not alone the temporary but the real value of every phase of love.

Was Arthur loveless—cold? He was hot enough in battle, in scourging of wrong-doers, in hand-clasp with his friend. His whole being was aflame for Guinevere.

> "But Arthur, looking downward as he passed,
> Felt the light of her eyes into his life
> Smite on the sudden."

> "And Arthur, passing thence to battle, felt
> Travail, and throes and agonies of the life,
> Desiring to be joined with Guinevere."

> "For, saving I be joined
> To her that is the fairest under heaven,
> I seem as nothing in the mighty world,
> And cannot will my will, nor work my work."

At the altar he vows to love her to the death, and his vows were truth. When she lies before him—at his feet—in the shame of her late confession of unworthiness, he cries in the anguish of a mortal wound:

> "I, whose vast pity almost makes me die
> To see thee laying there thy golden head,
> My pride in happier summers, at my feet."

> "My love, thro' flesh, hath wrought into my life
> So far that my doom is, I love thee still.
> Let no man dream but that I love thee still."

Is this the utterance of an insensible heart?

But Guinevere? She stands before the altar with hand in his, and speaks the vow he speaks: "King and my lord, I love thee to the death!" But on her lips the words are conscious falsehood. Here is the woman's great sin. The words were a part of the ceremony—she had to speak them to be married at all? Perhaps: if so, they certainly prove that, in those days dominated by Arthur, love was held of great importance to the marriage bond. But Guinevere was not compelled to wed with Arthur. The parental wish was usually obeyed but it was not obligatory. Women's inclinations were consulted. Yniol says to Enid's mother, when Geraint has asked for the maiden to wife:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Mother, a maiden is a tender thing,
And best by her that bore her understood.
Go thou to rest, but ere thou go to rest
Tell her, and prove her heart, toward the Prince."

The lady Lyonors

"Will not wed
Save whom she loveth, or a holy life."

True, there was no paternal pressure behind Lyonors, but the lines go, with many others, to show in what esteem love was held among these people.

Guinevere had only to speak, if but to ask for delay till she should be sure of her own mind. The King would not have touched the tip of her smallest finger, had he known she came to him with any but a full and free heart.

Why could not the two have uttered their thought? Lancelot knew the King, if Guinevere did not—knew that Arthur would have placed her hand in his and prayed a blessing on their heads; have bitten back his own pain and smiled upon them, and loved them always—both—the better for the strength and truth of their love for each other. But they lied; they lied by speech and they lied by silence; and in this falseness walked together into the hell that might have been a paradise.

Guinevere never let herself know the King. Preoccupied with Lancelot, she blinded herself to Arthur's qualities and must have repelled the warmth he would have shown. Though Arthur would not see the treason of the two dearest on earth to him, he must have been sensible of the involuntary withdrawal of a heart which did not hold him dear. Doubtless, he honored what seemed to him her purity, her superiority to the physical side of love—restrained himself, lest he hurt their high spiritual relation—made himself cold for her dear sake. And she, incapable of understanding his fine soul, but restless in her equivocal position, seeks always to excuse herself with his too faultless perfection, like the people who,

"since his ways are sweet,
And theirs are bestial, hold him less than man."

Yet she goes to Arthur's bed, receives his husband-kiss—then, "when the good King should not be there," opens her arms to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lancelot to recompense her sacrifice to the King. And you think "perhaps" this thing should not have been.

The world—the poet—never blamed Lancelot and Guinevere for falling in love; their affinity for each other had all the possibilities of an elevating and immortal attachment: the thing that condemns them is their enslavement to the flesh and their contemptible deceit.

> "Accursed, who strikes nor lets the hand be seen."

They were not happy, through it all—these infatuated ones. Their relation was a progressive torment. As they grew in experience—she in power to realize, he in actual knowledge of the consequences of their infidelity to the highest—they well-nigh reached despair. How otherwise?

I do not read this into the poems. It is all there, unmistakably revealed with infinite insight and consummate art.

Call up again the image of Guinevere. Is there any joy in her face—any lightness in her mien? Is she not the grave, the stately, sad-browed Queen? She knew no rest.

> "The Powers that tend the soul,
> To help it from the death that cannot die,
> And save it even in extremes, began
> To vex and plague her. Many a time for hours,
> Beside the placid breathings of the King,
> In the dead night, grim faces came and went
> Before her, or a vague spiritual fear."

In the scenes with Lancelot are jealousy, suspicion, reproach, fierce determination to recall the sweetness of their first meeting. And as for Lancelot, "the most disloyal friend in all the world," why not have quoted further, when you gave his words of faithfulness to the ruined woman who has all his knightly pity as well as his love?

> "I needs must break
> These bonds that so defame me: not without
> She wills it: would I, if she willed it? nay,
> Who knows? *but if I would not, then may God,*
> *I pray him, send a sudden angel down*
> *To seize me by the hair and bear me far*
> *And fling me deep in that forgotten mere,*
> *Among the tumbled fragments of the hills.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I know of nothing in literature to compare with this tale of lovers but the way in which Tolstoy makes us feel the sickening weariness of the unlawful relation of Vronsky and Anna Karenina.

And the result:

> "Then came the sin of Tristram and Isolt.
> Then others, following these my mightiest knights
> And drawing foul ensample from fair names,
> Sinn'd also."
>
> "The children born of thee are sword and fire,
> Red ruin, and *the breaking up of laws.*"

The "foul ensample" brings its inevitable consequences. Arthur's eyes are opened at last—his wife, his friend, his great ambition, his life's devotion, all blasted. Yet, through his suffering, he keeps faith, pity, love, hope. The woman is frightened, resentful, easily incensed, suspicious, petulant; stung to every manifestation of smarting pain by her conscience—her conscience, which could not be quite drugged to death through all these years of stupefying self-indulgence. For in Guinevere has grown, slowly, in spite of repression, the knowledge which makes Lancelot protest to young Lavaine's praises,

> "I am not great:
> *There* is the man."

She says to Lancelot, when jealousy stings her beyond self-control:

> "I for you
> This many a year have done despite and wrong
> To one whom ever in my heart of hearts
> I did acknowledge nobler—"

And again, in self-communion:

> "We needs must love the highest when we see it,
> Not Lancelot, nor another."

At last we have the incomparable scene of the parting between Arthur and Guinevere. He seeks her to give her soul repose, if it may be, through his forgiveness. Is there one syllable of his in that interview that speaks other than the unquenchable love

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a broken heart? The only words of reproach for Lancelot, even, among many of appreciation and praise, are those which you resent, "a smaller soul." Is that a harsh judgment upon the man who could, by robbing him secretly and shamefully of his dearest treasure, so cruelly betray the friend in whose heart he was cherished, in whose hand he had sworn eternal allegiance? Do not believe but that Arthur's grief over his friend's moral decay was as great as the bitterness of his own loss.

The moment comes when Arthur must leave the Queen—there is no future for them on earth, but he loves her still, he longs to touch the dear golden hair, if only he might. He loves her so well that he must hope that somewhere, sometime, in that eternity which had not been questioned in those days, when her soul has been freed from the imperfect body, she will recognize, not her earthly legal bond to him—it is not this he cries out for in the words you so sadly misread—but that her unsealed vision may see and claim with joy his love, his holy, deathless love. And, even in this mighty hope, there is no suggestion of his right to her. He does not say, "Thou shalt be bound to me through all eternity, because I was thy husband here before the law"—there is no intimation of such a thought; he says,

> "*Perchance*, and so thou purify thy soul,"

and

> "Leave me that,
> I charge thee, my last *hope*."

One does not "hope" for that of which one has assurance. And Guinevere, when he was gone,

> "Stretched out her arms and cried aloud
> 'Oh Arthur! . . . .
> . . . . now I see thee what thou art,
> Thou art the highest and most human too,
> Not Lancelot, nor another. Is there none
> Will tell the king I love him tho' so late?'"

The ideal portrayed in Arthur's relation to Guinevere is one, it seems to me, worthy to endure far beyond the twentieth century.

Meanwhile, leaving aside the monstrous idea that has arrogated to itself the name of "free love," as if it were not bondage to the lowest in us, let us allow that divorce is still, sometimes,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the only deliverance from a situation not only intolerable to a wedded pair but injurious to their children and, through them, to humanity. Still, this twentieth century, which you would have us think has advanced beyond Tennyson's sincere but "ridiculous" veneration for the marriage bond, is really nearer than any of the preceding centuries to sustaining it. The institution of marriage is itself a sign of the upward growth of humanity. It becomes not less, but more, binding as the spiritual evolves and dominates the physical.

To-day men and women of the highest development, prophetic therefore of the future type, seek each other only when the mind's approval seconds the body's impulse. They join their lives with the deliberate intention of bearing and rearing, through long periods of tutelage, the new men and women for whom they are responsible, to the end that they may be more than individuals, living for their personal experiences—with the purpose that they shall become, consciously, members of the great body of humanity, having a part in its upward progress. To such men and women it is not religious duty to follow unquestioningly the first promptings of youthful passion; heart's boundless love they give, but it must follow the vision of the highest. In their belief, to love one only and to cleave to her implies and involves public acknowledgment of the relationship and its theoretic, ever more and more to be actualized, inviolability. If marriage without love is not marriage, so also love which does violence to marriage is not love. The marriage ceremony is not a proclamation of imprisonment but of opportunity; its bond is not a fetter but a garland. Still, it may not be disdained or broken. The crowning does not make the king, you say. No; but it places upon the man whose head receives the crown the obligation to sacrifice, if need be, everything that is mortal in him to its honor.

JULIET EVERTS ROBB.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG: ROME: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *May, 1905.*

THAT a country may be aristocratic in its society and Radical and even Socialistic in its politics is a paradox that has become almost a commonplace. Nor does its converse hold any the less good. A country may be an unmitigated Democracy in its social standards and its social atmosphere, and yet display in the conduct of its public affairs a spirit of Conservatism not far removed from Toryism. Great Britain is an example of the former type of nation and the United States of the latter; and it is not a little curious that, at the very moment when the Supreme Court dealt its smashing blow at the legislative regulation of hours of labor, the English Parliament should be taking a gigantic stride towards the Socialist ideal. I refer particularly to the Unemployed Bill, which is only one of several recent incidents that show the growing power of Labor in our politics and the increasing absorption of Parliament in questions of social reform.

On almost the last day of April, for instance, the Local Government Board issued a circular to the various Boards of Guardians on the subject of underfed children at the public elementary schools. A painfully large number of school children go through their daily lessons in a state of semi-starvation or actual starvation. All such cases are henceforward to be relieved by the local Boards of Guardians on the application of the child itself or of the managers and teachers of the school attended. The relief given is to be considered as a loan by the local authority to the father of the child, unless there is satisfactory proof that the cause of the child's destitution is the father's inability, not his refusal or neglect, to provide proper food. Unless such proof

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be produced the Boards of Guardians are authorized to recover from the father the cost of the food given. In all cases, before relief is afforded, the father is to be communicated with and an opportunity allowed him of providing the proper food himself. No relief is to be given for a longer period than one month; but the application can be renewed if necessary. In cases where the application is repeatedly renewed and where, nevertheless, there is reason to believe that the parent is able to provide proper food, the Guardians are advised to proceed against him under the Vagrancy Act or the Cruelty to Children Act. The relief is not to take the form of money, but of food-tickets issued upon local charities or upon shopkeepers. This part of the scheme has been a good deal criticised. No such local charity for the provision of meals may exist and orders on shopkeepers issued by the Relieving Officer are clumsy, uneconomical and liable to obvious abuse. Moreover, so long as the matter is left to the Guardians, the charge remains a parochial one, and the poorest districts, already crying out against the pressure of the rates, may be tempted to neglect their duties. On the other hand, if the charge were made an Educational one, it would be spread over the whole area of the local Education authority. But nobody, I should imagine, can believe that this scheme is likely to be final, even if the objections to it in its present form are removed. It is inevitably but a step towards the feeding of all public-school children by the State, at a cost which would be borne mainly, of course, by the parents, but partially by the community at large.

Again, the Aliens Bill was carried through its second reading on May 2d by a majority of 152. But, on reflection, I am not quite sure whether that should be quoted as an instance either of the political power of Labor or of the increasing absorption of Parliament in questions of social reform. Mr. Keir Hardie, who is the leading spirit of the Independent Labor Party, announced a few days ago his intention of opposing it in Committee. "All the facts at present," he said, "went to show that the alien question had been manufactured by a party for party purposes." This statement was made, not in the House of Commons, but before the delegates of the Independent Labor Party at their annual meeting, and by them it was warmly cheered. Mr. Hardie went on to say that, during the Committee stage of the Bill, he would move that "no Bill dealing with the alien question could be ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cepted as satisfactory which did not make it illegal for aliens to be brought to this country to take the place of workmen during a trade dispute, or for employers to employ aliens except at the trade-union rate of wages." I need scarcely say that there is no chance of the Committee's adopting either of Mr. Hardie's amendments, but his criticisms of the Bill are none the less interesting and pertinent. He is particularly near the mark in saying that the alien question has been manufactured by a party for party purposes. Had he said "used" instead of "manufactured," he would have been absolutely correct. There was no need to manufacture the alien question; it already exists; and in the East End of London, or at any rate in sections of it, it has led, as I endeavored to show in a previous letter, to a considerable displacement of the British population, to an intense and inhuman industrial competition, to overcrowding, "sweating," a lowering of the standards of decent living, and the influx of a number of undesirables who come upon the rates and fill the prisons. The feeling about this evil in such districts as Stepney and Whitechapel is not so very far below the intensity of Californian feeling over Chinese immigration. But one must discriminate. The alien the East-Ender objects to is not so much the criminal, the pauper or the "undesirables" of both sexes, as the hard-working, sharp-witted, thrifty and ambitious competitor. But to keep him out is to keep all aliens out. It is, in effect, to say that no Russian or Polish Jew shall be permitted to land and live in England; and that is an extreme to which no British Government is ever likely to advance. The supporters of the Aliens Bill are, therefore, in a dilemma. They wish to appear as the protector of the British working-men against the competition of foreign immigrants. But the Aliens Bill which they have actually introduced is directed, not against those whose competition is really formidable, but against paupers, criminals, the diseased and the vicious—in short, against those whose capacity to compete with British labor is virtually negligible. The Bill will do nothing to prevent overcrowding or "sweating," or to soften the edge of industrial competition. I doubt, indeed, whether it will lead to the exclusion of more than a few hundred "undesirables" a year. "It is an affair," as "The Daily Chronicle" justly remarked, "of public health and police, not of economics"; and Mr. Chamberlain's attempt to trumpet it abroad as a measure for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the defence of the British working-man against underpaid labor, and to argue that its logical sequel should be a Bill to exclude the goods made by such labor in other lands, marked, I think, the lowest depths of disingenuousness to which even he has yet descended. The Bill simply makes arrangements which, while preserving England as an asylum for political refugees, aim at the exclusion of paupers and the mentally, morally and physically unfit, and at the transportation and expulsion of such aliens as may prove a burden to the rates or may be convicted of criminal offences. In other words, it touches merely the fringe of the alien question; nor am I sure that it touches even that much in a practical way or that the machinery it proposes to erect will prove adequate to its task. What, however, is indisputable is that it will do nothing to improve industrial conditions in the East End. Its supporters know that it cannot have any such result, however much they may find it politically convenient to mislead their constituents into believing that it may. On the other hand, as a measure of self-defence against the dumping of human rubbish on these islands, its purpose makes a wide appeal to the common sense of the nation and of both political parties.

But, if it is stretching a point to ascribe the Aliens Bill to the influence of Labor, there can be little question as to where the origin of the Unemployed Bill should be sought. It may be remembered that last autumn, when there was every prospect of a winter of exceptional distress, Mr. Long, then the President of the Local Government Board, made an attempt to unify and bring into cooperation all the agencies of charitable relief in London. In each of the twenty-eight boroughs into which London is divided, a joint Committee was formed from the local Borough Council and the local Board of Guardians to work in consultation and harmony with the parochial and charitable associations of the neighborhood. Thus a unity of aim and method was secured in each district. The next step was to apply the same principle of unification to all the districts. This was done by the creation of a Central Committee which undertook a general work of direction, supervision and allocation of the funds that were raised by voluntary subscriptions. The scheme worked on the whole fairly well, though it was greatly hampered by the refusal of some of the wealthier Borough Councils to contribute. The present Bill proposes, in effect, to make what was provisional and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voluntary in the scheme permanent and statutory. The local committees are to be permanent bodies, and the Central Committee likewise is to be permanent. The Central Committee will have power to levy a rate of one halfpenny in the pound—rising by special permission of the Local Government Board to one penny—over the whole administrative area of London. As a penny in the pound yields about $900,000, it will be seen that there is nothing to prevent the proposed Central Authority from spending something like $450,000 a year in the relief of the unemployed. The duty of the local bodies will be that of sorting over the applications, dividing the genuine unemployed from the unemployable, and doing what they can to *find* work for the former. The Central Authority alone will be empowered to *provide* work, and the only kind of work it will be permitted to provide will be work on a farm colony.

Such, in brief, is the scheme. It has one vital defect. While the provisions of the Bill are compulsory in London, they are optional outside of London. Thus London will be compelled to start special machinery for dealing with the unemployed, with special rating powers, but neither the County nor the Borough Councils in the provinces would be obliged to follow suit. That could only mean in practice that London would become a magnet to draw all the unemployed, all the unemployable, all the tramps and wastrels in the kingdom. They will flock in thousands to the metropolis to get a share in the good things going, and convert London into a clearing-house of all the destitution and most of the rescality in the whole country. If the Bill is to become law at all, it is argued, it must be made equally operative throughout the kingdom, and each administrative area must be compelled to provide for its own unemployed. But it is not on this point alone that the Bill is attacked. The restriction to a halfpenny and even a penny rate is denounced as wholly futile, and the idea of confining all the employment provided to work on a farm colony is scouted as impracticable. Once it is admitted that the unemployed have a right to look to the community for work, then work will have to be found for them at whatever cost, and as the vast majority of the unemployed are unskilled urban laborers of almost every trade and occupation except agriculture, it is clear that a farm colony will scarcely meet their needs. I need scarcely say that the whole principle of the measure—that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is the duty of the community to provide work for the temporarily unemployed—is an entirely novel one in English legislation; that it is fiercely disputed; that it is still more fiercely disputed because the Bill does not propose to disfranchise those who accept the employment thus offered; and that there are many who believe that, if it is ever carried into effect, the Bill will not only create paupers, but prevent them from being anything else but paupers.

There is, however, one party that heartily accepts it and is only concerned in strengthening and extending its application. That is the Independent Labor Party. That this party is the nucleus of what will one day prove a mighty organization must, I think, be evident to all observers of English politics. It is, therefore, interesting to consider the main lines of its policy as laid down a few days ago at its annual meeting. The delegates present passed resolutions in favor of providing free meals for school children and of giving municipalities power to undertake such enterprises as the public supply of coal, bread, milk and dairy and farm produce. Other resolutions condemned the Chinese Labor Ordinance, the treatment of Post-Office and other Government employees, and the War-Office mismanagement of contracts in South Africa. Besides this, the Independent Labor Party declared for a complete scheme of decentralization (including, of course, Home Rule), for the payment of Members of Parliament, for adult suffrage for both sexes, for local control of the drink traffic and for a national treatment of the unemployed question. These, however, are the stock items on every Labor programme. But what was really novel in the proceedings of the Independent Labor Party was the contempt it showed for official Liberalism. It adopted a motion forbidding members of the Party to speak under the auspices of the Free-Trade League, not because Labor favors Protection, but because Labor is determined not to be merged in Liberalism, but to play the old Nationalist game of complete independence, tempered by occasional alliances for particular objects. That is a significant sign of the times. There is, indeed, no question of English politics more momentous than the future relations between Liberalism and Labor. Trade-Unionism, which in theory is the antithesis of Socialism, is developing on Socialist lines; the proletariat is just beginning to show some consciousness of its political power and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the strength that organization brings; the next Liberal Cabinet will undoubtedly contain at least one representative of Labor; and though the Labor men in the House of Commons are few, have no real leader and show none of the Irish instinct for Parliamentary warfare, they command an immense following in the country, and are, I believe, destined to prove the controlling element in the new Liberalism. Already the municipalities have fallen largely into the hands of the working classes, and their policy and enterprises show a progressive leaning towards Socialism. It cannot be long before Parliament takes a decisive hand in the movement. Compared with that prospect, all the minor incidents of this or any other month—Lord Kitchener's "strike" for a greater official freedom, Mr. Balfour's latest effort to find a platform on which all Tariff Reformers may unite, the chances of a General Election, which some people are confident cannot be postponed beyond June—are merely the happenings of an hour.

ST. PETERSBURG, *May, 1905.*

"TIME and tide wait for one man" would seem to be the maxim according to which 140,000,000 Russians are now being governed; and the one man, although a hereditary ruler, can hardly be said to be a born leader. Neither, unhappily, would he seem to be the friend of those who are. Hence, in the methods of the Government, there is little evidence either of statesmanlike intelligence or set purpose, and ministers pursuing aims which are often mischievous sometimes adopt the only measures calculated to defeat them. Thus one day a step is taken in the direction of popular liberty; another day, a recoil is made towards mediæval absolutism, or, what is more noticeable still, a principle is solemnly laid down by the monarch himself for carrying on the nation's affairs, and his ministers thereupon set about realizing it by means which, far from efficacious, are positively antagonistic. And that is a fair description of the latest phase of the tragedy of cross-purposes from which all Russia is suffering. A number of grievances were bitterly complained of by the press, and nearly all sections of the nation at once supported the demand for their redress. The Emperor, however, publicly stigmatized the would-be reformers as seditious demagogues, denied the existence of the wrongs, the need of reform and also the fact that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people had any wish for change. But when petition had become remonstrance and remonstrance bordered on revolt, he expressly admitted all that he had previously called in question, generously undertook not only to remove the abuses, but to abolish their causes; and exhorted his subjects, especially pressmen, to assist him in the arduous task. And immediately after that came ministerial circulars, government communications and measures of police repression, all of which ran directly counter to the Tsar's specific promises. That is what was done with the working-men's demands and with the petitions of the doctors, the zemstvos, the press; and, since my last letter, it has been suddenly and ruthlessly applied to the peasants.

The peasantry constitute about eighty per cent. of the entire population and number over 100,000,000; and the terrible danger of the present situation lies precisely in their suddenly taking things into their own hands and attempting to right their wrongs by force. Agrarian disorders on a large scale would be an appalling scourge. The men who know rural Russia best, experienced members of the zemstvo, like General Kouzmin-Karavayeff, Prince Schakhoffskoy and M. Petrunkevitch, who are in close touch with the mujiks, state with trepidation that, unless very speedy remedial measures are applied, the peasantry may rise and sweep everybody and everything before them, destroying liberals and conservatives, wiping out the good institutions together with the bad, and obliterating every vestige of culture in their way. Such an elemental movement would exceed in destructiveness and horror the *Jacquerie* of the French peasants, who, at the close of the war with England in the middle of the fourteenth century, rose up against the well-to-do people, reduced hundreds of castles to ashes, put noblemen to death with refined accompaniments of bestial cruelty and turned a vast stretch of land into a wilderness of ruins. For the Russian peasants are more numerous than was Jacques Bonhomme, more violent, less amenable to reason.

A picture of the Russian peasant's daily existence, as it really is, would shock the average American and anger those who respect the dignity of manhood. Here is a scene taken exactly as it unfolded itself to the spectators' gaze: The land superior—who is always a magistrate, as well as an administrator—of the Kherson District, wishing to punish a peasant named Shkoda,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sent a summons to him, which was delivered to the man's namesake, V. J. Shkoda. The wrong man consequently left his house and village, appeared before the land superior, explained the mistake and was of course discharged. In spite of this, he was again called on to answer the charge after a couple of weeks had elapsed. He then pleaded that it was all a mistake, a mistake already recognized by the land superior, and that his namesake was probably the person wanted. But the authorities, deaf to his explanations, sent the police to take him by force, and then despatched him, along with criminals, from forwarding prison to forwarding prison in clanking iron chains to the town where the tribunal was situated. And for over three weeks that innocent man was kept in prison awaiting his trial. Brought before the court, the blunder was revealed in a few minutes, and V. J. Shkoda heard the words: "Go back to your hut, you . . . . scoundrel; you are not the criminal." The ejaculation was uttered by M. Ingoostoff, the land superior, one of the official class created by Tsar Alexander III to act "as parents towards the helpless peasants." Filial love is not the sentiment which the peasants, no longer quite helpless, cherish towards these "steppe fathers."

Again, the tiller of the soil has far too little land for the needs of himself and his family, and the produce of that little is taxed exorbitantly. On the other hand, he sees round him square miles of excellent black loam or other fertile soil lying fallow. Whose is it? He cares not whether it belongs to a private landowner or the Crown. "The Tsar's?" he replies to those who tell him he must not covet what belongs to the Little Father. "The Tsar's? Well, and we peasants are also the Tsar's. It will be good for us, and for the Tsar, and for everybody, if we turn that fallow land into yellow corn-fields. We don't want to rob the Crown, or the squire, or anybody else. We'll buy it. But let whoever owns it sell it on reasonable terms. But we cannot and will not let it lie fallow for years and years while we are starving for want of bread."

How heavily the burden of taxation weighs upon the husbandman, nobody who has not lived in the country can realize. For there are shades and hues and forms of misery which cannot be painted in words, because the onlooker is himself hardly conscious of them as they pass through his senses and contribute to produce a deep impression on his mind. The official zemstvo data,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however, give one a fair notion of the way in which the Russian husbandman is pinched and pressed, while the intelligent classes are pampered and privileged by the Government. A peasant's family consisting of three persons able to work and of three children pays yearly to the treasury in duty on 12 lbs. of tea, $5 74; in excise on 1 1-3 stone of sugar, $3 40; on 108 lbs. of petroleum, 95 cents; for a case of matches, $1 59; for a jar of vodka, $6 70; in duty on various articles bought throughout the year, $2 64; redemption tax for three shares of land, $23 41; to the clergy, $13 20; sum total, $57 63. That is an enormous sum for the family of a peasant to scrape together, even when he spends his winter months working in steel-yards or cotton-mills.

This state of things cannot last; yet the war, with its vast demands, has made it very much worse. The cholera, too, is expected to intensify the fears and aggravate the sufferings of the rural population, and foresighted people announce the coming of a cataclysm.

Russia's best men are become prophets of evil in the hope of doing good. General Kossitch, for example, who for many years was a successful governor of a province and is now commander of the military district of Kazan, stated publicly a few days ago that "agrarian reforms are imperatively needed at once. Unless they are bestowed and without delay, Russia is threatened within a month or two with horrible deeds of blood."

The Tsar has been aware of that danger for some time, and when the impression was still deep he did the best he could to ward it off. Last Christmas day, he issued a Ukase promising full rights to the tillers of the soil "by merging the laws which relate to the peasants in the general legislation of the Empire." Witte thereupon took the matter in hand; his own scheme of agrarian reform, a system marked by simplicity, thoroughness and vitality, was to be embodied in law, and by a stroke of the Imperial pen the peasants were to be freed from the bonds which have continued to hamper them ever since they ceased to be serfs. The work of formulating the measures was being carried on by a special Commission under Witte's guidance. This body had collected, sifted, classified and published the views of the peasants themselves, as well as of the most distinguished specialists—eleven thousand opinions in all. The Commission was about to hold its penultimate meeting to concert measures for enabling the mujiks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to purchase more land; Professor Postnikoff was to read his report on a certain day, and late, very late, the night before, the Commission was dissolved forever by the Tsar.

What had happened was this: The all-powerful head of the Most Holy Synod, Pobiedonostseff, had resolved, for reasons which will appear later on, "to render the Russian Mirabeau harmless." And with the help of the *crème de la crème* of the Autocratic party he succeeded. This party, of which nothing has ever yet been written, is composed of men who include Count S. Scheremetieff, the friend of the Emperor and Empress; Prince Putyatin, the factotum of the Empress; M. Stürmer, a candidate for the Ministry of the Interior, on whose shoulders the mantle of Plehve is supposed to have descended: a landowner of the nobility named Pavloff, who would, if he could, reintroduce the state of serfdom abolished by Alexander II, and several others. One of these persons, whose name it is needless to mention, had the subject of agrarian reform explained at length to the Tsar, and the urgency of adopting energetic measures brought home to him. Thus, His Majesty was informed that the peasants had risen in twelve or more provinces, had burned manor-houses, cut down timber, removed boundaries and taken private land. They had received and distributed proclamations announcing the impending division among the people of lands belonging to the Crown and to private proprietors. And all these lamentable errors of the peasantry were, it was alleged, the work of Witte, and could be stopped only by removing the entire question from his care and dissolving the special Commission of which he was the President.

The Tsar was naturally alarmed, and the spokesman of the clique took care to intensify his apprehensions. Haste, he urged, was peremptory; the symptoms must be treated like an incipient conflagration. And His Majesty assented. After a lively discussion, the conspirators carried their point and got Nicholas II to act. A special messenger was despatched to St. Petersburg to inform all whom it might concern of his Majesty's orders, and to have the disintegrating Ukase of April 12th printed. And, quite unexpectedly, S. Y. Witte, the President of His Majesty's Committee of Ministers, and Chairman of the Special Commission for the study of the needs of the peasants, learned that he had been dismissed from the chairmanship of this latter body, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the Commission itself had been dissolved; on the other hand, ex-Minister Goremykin, a bland nonentity, was surprised to find himself gazetted as the chairman of a new agrarian commission which would be created a few days later and would begin its studies *da capo*. S. Y. Witte was, it is alleged, "greatly displeased," and there would seem to be some grounds for the statement. He had served the Tsar devotedly and well. The war, dear to the heart of the Emperor, was being waged on the money hoarded by Witte. Yet that Minister had been publicly slighted in a way which an English maid-of-all-work would vigorously resent. As for the peasants, they were informed that landed property would be safeguarded from every design upon it, and that all the men of a village would be held jointly responsible for damage done.

Many loyal Russians regret that the Tsar should deal so autocratically with his one statesman, his many ministers and his countless people. That the ex-Finance Minister should be harshly dealt with is, perhaps, unimportant. He is only a statesman. The other advisers whom the Tsar himself called to his Council might have been consulted on the subject with profit. The disregard with which they were treated two years ago led unavoidably to the war with Japan; and the contempt now displayed towards them may lead to a civil war of a much more terrible character. As for the people, who have never been treated differently, they are not surprised, but only impatient at it all, having ceased to believe in ukases, rescripts and manifestoes. But their impatience is the most dangerous element in the situation.

Witte, too, is deemed a disturbing factor in the Russian Empire, and the policy of the whole Tsardom is modified just to anger him. He is President of the *Committee* of Ministers and would, it is rumored, gladly resign if he dared, but he is not allowed to go. However that may be, it is certain that, in order to avoid coming into contact with him, the Tsar transferred the questions in which he was himself interested to another slightly different body, the *Council* of Ministers, under his own Presidency, making Count Solsky Vice-President. Merely to shun Witte! And now eighty per cent. of the population of Russia have been either condemned to suffer indefinitely or stung to aggression against the other twenty per cent. of the population, in order solely that Witte might be humiliated. The American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reader may get a clearer idea of how suddenly, secretly and vigorously the court conspiracy was hatched and carried out, when he is told that none of the Tsar's Ministers was consulted or even informed of what was going on behind their backs. The accomplished fact was sprung upon them all without warning. Even the Grand-Duke Alexander Mikhailovitch—nay, the Tsar himself—had no suspicion of what was coming. For on Wednesday, April 12th, there was an important sitting of the Commission, and it was settled that there would be another on the following Saturday. As late as Thursday at noon, the Tsar sent to the Privy Councillor Shipoff, the Secretary of the Commission, an imperial ukase appointing the Grand-Duke Alexander Mikhailovitch to be a member of the Commission. Two hours later, however, Shipoff received another ukase dissolving the Commission, scattering its labors to the four winds of heaven, and chastising Witte for—the sake of a court clique.

Thus the Russian peasants are being trifled with, just as the Japanese Government was played with by the Autocracy shortly before the war. From day to day, from month to month, the Mikado's Ambassador, Baron Kurino, was put off, now on one frivolous pretext, now on another, until one day he presented a note breaking off the "futile negotiations," and transferring the issues to the battle-field.

Something analogous bids fair to occur in the interior of Russia. The whole system by which the peasants are, so to say, drugged, blinded and enslaved has been condemned by the zemstvos, the nobility, the professors and the journalists—in a word, by all Russia. Then the Tsar himself unwillingly but solemnly endorsed the view of his people, and condemned the system utterly. Yet he will not allow something better to be put in its place, although he even cannot preserve the old edifice now. It is tottering to its foundations. Shortly, there will be nothing left of it: but neither will there be anything set up in its place, because all serious efforts to build up another system are being thwarted, and thwarted by court conspirators who, in the Tsar's own palace, scheme in his name and with his assent, but assuredly not to his advantage.

The story of Church reform, which is typical, ought to be fairly well known by now. Like every other liberal reform, its history is bound up with Witte, who strove to embody, not indeed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liberty of conscience, but the principles of mild toleration, in a number of propositions which were to be afterwards formulated by lawyers and entered on the Statute Book. The gist of them is that members of the Orthodox Church, who, down to last Easter Sunday, could not forsake their creed with impunity, may do so in future provided that they join a Christian sect. The necessary sequel to this and kindred innovations was a reform of the government of the Orthodox Church itself, which, so long as it remains the mere handmaid of the State, cannot compete with any of the great religious communities, all of which are free. Therefore, Orthodoxy ought to be ruled by its own members, and not by the civil functionaries; and Witte, having made this quite clear to the Tsar, was requested by him to draw up a scheme of reform for the Orthodox fold. The statesman willingly accepted the task, and discharged it rapidly and well, proposing mainly two measures: first, that the State should remove its heavy hand from Orthodoxy, and, secondly, that a purely ecclesiastical council be convened to discuss the needs of the Church and the ways and means of satisfying them.

The Tsar was ready to approve both these reforms, when Constantine P. Pobiedonostseff, then ill, heard of the latter scheme, besought the Most High to frustrate it, and then proceeded to hear his own prayer. He went cautiously to work, not disapproving what was done, but rather encouraging those ecclesiastics who were minded to to go farther—and they went farther, too far, indeed, just as he had expected them to do. They asked for the restoration of the Patriarchate of the whole Russian Church —a dignity which has not existed since the days of Peter the Great; and they requested the Tsar to summon a council without delay to elect the dignitary. Then the "wily old Jesuit of Orthodoxy," who had signed his own name together with those of the bishops, wrote to his Imperial master strongly advising him not to accede to the hasty, injudicious and dangerously radical demands of the episcopate. The bishops and archbishops who to-day wanted a Patriarch might, perhaps, to-morrow ask for a republic. Nicholas II, alarmed, promulgated a short, sharp refusal. Orthodoxy was to remain dragged down by her secular fetters and gyves. Sectarianism, too? people asked. Assuredly, men answered; for were it otherwise, if the penal laws were to be abolished which keep the sects from decimating the ranks of Orthodoxy, the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dition of the State Church would become critical and alarming. And as the Tsar will do nothing to harm his own Church, they argued, both projects drafted by Witte will be shelved.

But, on Easter Sunday, an Imperial ukase was published, striking the fetters off the sectarians, and leaving the Orthodox Christians bound to the State like the wretched criminals whom Mezentius had strapped to a corpse. Henceforth non-conformists can freely convoke their own councils when they like, appoint their worthiest clerics to archiepiscopal and episcopal sees, and take all other measures which they deem necessary for the welfare of their religious community. But two or three bishops of the Orthodox Church may not assemble anywhere, without the permission of one civil functionary, and the presence of another during their discussion. It is one of these civil servants, and not the Church, who appoints dignitaries and removes them. In like manner, important sermons cannot be delivered, in any Orthodox cathedral, which have not first been read and approved.

But, after all, the mistakes made by the Autocracy in the ecclesiastical sphere will not profoundly influence the affairs of this world. Hence they are interesting chiefly as symptoms. They show that not only statesmanship which is a genuine luxury, but average intelligence and will which are primary necessities, of good government are absent from the administration of the Tsardom, and that the vast Slav nation of 140,000,000 is governed by fitful vagaries. Whether, as many Russians reluctantly believe, one of the results of this arbitrary misrule will be a tremendous upheaval by the peasant Enceladus, a catastrophe which will leave traces on all future stages of culture, and give its name to all civilized languages, time alone can say. *Qui vivra verra.*

ROME, *May, 1905.*

"I AM convinced that not only with regard to the railway employees, but in all and in every branch of the Administration, the authority of the State needs to be strengthened, and this is what I intend to accomplish; but it is not the work of a day, as we can take only a step at a time." This statement, made before the Senate by Signor Fortis, the new Premier, shortly after he had assumed power and while the railway strike was going on, is sufficiently eloquent to give, at one and the same time, an idea of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the internal situation in Italy, and of the programme of the new Cabinet. It is, in other words, a repetition of what half a century ago Massimo D'Azeglio, patriot, novelist, painter and politician, who was Premier under the great Victor Emanuel, said: "Now that Italy is made, we must make the Italians." The two statements mean that, although twenty-five years were spent in the struggle for the unity and independence of Italy, and thirty-five more have passed since the taking of Rome, such a period is totally inadequate to make those who govern and the people, morally, intellectually and politically, equal to the new conditions of their country.

In less than fifty years, Italy had to do what other nations accomplished gradually in the course of centuries; so, notwithstanding all possible energy in the rulers and the bearing of heavy burdens under the form of taxation by the people, the means have not always been sufficient to reach the proposed aim. She was almost totally without modern ways of communication; in many parts of the south, the rivers were without bridges; and the only means of conveyance were carts drawn by oxen, nor were any diligences as yet running. To repair such a deplorable state of things, 10,000 miles of railway were built, which are still insufficient. Compared with the area of the country, Italy has, in fact, only about one-half of the mileage of the lines of other European nations, and only one-third of those of Belgium, not counting, of course, Russia, Spain, Portugal and the Balkans, which are still more backward in this respect. This state of inferiority, together with the large amount spent in a short time to build the network of railways, has hampered their activity, so that they still represent a deficit of $28,000,000 yearly. Notwithstanding this, the railway employees, although not paid as much as abroad, may be called, considering the average wage in Italy, one of the comparatively well-to-do classes. However, taking advantage of their organization, of the indispensability of their services, and of the serious damage which results from a suspension of railway traffic, they have constantly succeeded in obtaining further advantages, the last and most important having been that secured in 1902, when Government and companies granted an appropriation in their favor of 4,000,000 dollars to be spread over three years, to be increased later to 3,600,000 dollars yearly.

Encouraged by this success, the railwaymen thought themselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

invincible, and scarcely three years had passed when they demanded new and more important concessions, directed chiefly to an increase of their pay, amounting to 20,000,000 dollars, and the acknowledgment of their right to combine and to strike. In their agitation they were pushed and supported by all the subversive elements, especially by the revolutionist section of the Socialists, who wished to take their revenge for the complete fiasco of the attempt at a general strike last September. In this movement they despised the advice to be moderate which came from the most enlightened men even of the extreme parties, and assumed an attitude of open defiance of the authority and power of the State, and of the interests of almost all classes of citizens, including those whom they desired to have as allies in a general strike. They entirely mistook the situation and the conditions they had to contend with. The general election, to which Signor Giolitti had the ability to have recourse immediately after the excesses in the attempt at a general strike, returned a Chamber more conservative than the former, whilst the people remained adverse to any efforts to disturb public order. These conditions, in which the railway strike was prepared and proclaimed, even influenced about one-third of the railwaymen themselves, who did not abandon their work; while Parliament passed the bill for the resumption of the railways by the State, almost without discussion, including the articles forbidding strikes and punishing strikers, which under normal conditions would not have been approved, on the ground that it would prove of no practical utility. All the other classes of workmen refused to join the railwaymen in a general strike, so that the latter resumed work just at the time at which Parliament approved the very bill for the presentation of which they had struck.

The same unpreparedness may be noticed in foreign policy, in which, however, Italy has acquired lately greater weight, due partly to her position, partly to events independent of herself. Even the Papacy, that during the Pontificates of Pius IX and Leo XIII was depicted as the "internal enemy," has been made use of to the advantage of present institutions, as although the statement made in the November number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW was denied—that the meeting between Signor Giolitti and Count von Bülow at Homburg had also the object of obtaining, through the influence of Germany, that the Holy See should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tacitly allow the Italian Clericals to participate in political contests—it is a fact that the Clericals, for the first time since 1870, not only voted, but even elected some of their representatives, while the choosing of a considerable number of candidates was discussed, through intermediaries, between the Government and the Church authorities. The result was the election of a Chamber which is the most conservative we have had, since the Conservatives, for the first time, went out of power in 1876, and which will certainly strengthen the tendency in favor of Italy's remaining bound to the Triple Alliance, which, in the eyes of the less Liberal elements, is not only a feature of our foreign policy, but also a guarantee against too democratic internal movements. Still what a difference between the situation at the beginning of the Triple Alliance, when Italy, fearing an attack from France, had to make advances to be admitted, and now, when she is implored to remain! And what a difference also in the conditions to be fulfilled by the Peninsula! When Marquis di Rudinì renewed the alliance in 1891 Italy pledged herself, in case France should attack Germany, to send two divisions of troops, through the Tyrol, to fight on the Franco-German frontier. Any such condition was suppressed in the last renewal of the Alliance, in 1902, which contains no clause that may sound hostile to France or to any other country. The weak point of the Alliance is the relations between Italy and Austria, and this is why the meeting at Venice, on April 29th, between Count Goluchowski and Senator Tittoni, aroused so much interest. The dislike of Austria is innate in all Italians, and is kept alive by Austria still holding two Italian provinces, Trent and Triest, and by her continuing there the system which led to the loss of the Lombardo Venetian provinces—that is to say, doing all in her power to suppress the Italian sympathies and nationality of the inhabitants, obtaining, however, as is only natural, the contrary effect, besides fostering the "irredentist" sentiment in Italy. She has constantly tried to Germanize the province of Trent; while, as for Triest, after having completely failed in the same attempt, she is now endeavoring to make it Slav. In reality, nothing has helped so much the unity of Italy as the attitude of Austria.

The problem which now remains urgent and important for the Peninsula is the defence of her interests in the seas which surround her, by preventing any further extension of the great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Powers along the Eastern coast of the Adriatic or in the Balkans, and by claiming that no other country but herself should succeed Turkey in Tripoli. Of course, the first part of this programme is entirely directed against Austria, or, at least, it is entirely with Austria that it has to be understood and settled. There was a period, during the existence of the Zanardelli Cabinet, in which Italy during the revival of irredentism, assumed almost an aggressive attitude against her ally, in view of the alleged intention of Austria to occupy the district of Novi Bazar, near the Servian frontier. Then the Italian grand manœuvres were purposely held near the Austrian frontier, and directed personally by King Victor Emanuel III, amidst such fiery enthusiasm that it recalled to the old veterans the days of 1848, in the first war against Austria. Contemporaneously, it was hinted that General Ricciotti Garibaldi, the only surviving son of the great hero, was ready with 10,000 volunteers for a dash on the coast of Istria, or into the mountains of the Tyrol, repeating the exploits of his father in 1866. Austria answered by massing 30,000 men on the Italian frontier, and out of all this came the first meeting between Senator Tittoni and Count Goluchowski at Abbazia, where the discussion led to the conclusion that Austria, although authorized by the Treaty of Berlin, would not occupy Novi Bazar, whilst Italy would not attempt anything against her neighbor. The meeting at Venice has completed the understanding between the two countries with regard to the whole Eastern question, in which Italy has gradually attracted into her sphere of influence Montenegro, Servia and Bulgaria. With regard to Albania, the coast of which is within sight of that of Italy, an understanding exists, initiated by Marquis Visconti Venosta and completed by Signor Prinetti, for the maintenance of the *status quo*. In Macedonia, Russia being distracted by the war with Japan, Austria had been acquiring too great preponderance, so that Italy has supported the proposition of England to extend the intervention of the other Powers to the finances of that region, whilst until now they had only participated in the reorganization of the gendarmerie, under the direction of the Italian General di Giorgis. Finally, another question which is again becoming urgent is that of Crete, in which Italy has a prominent part, as the International Committee deciding all Cretan affairs sits in Rome, under the Presidency of the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Mediterranean there is only one region left where Italian expansion is possible, viz., Tripoli, which Italy considers it vital for her own interests should not fall into the hands of any other nation, as otherwise she would be, as they say here, suffocated in her own seas.

In 1901, Italy and France, coming to an understanding with regard to their reciprocal interests in the Mediterranean, agreed that the Peninsula should put forward no claims on Morocco, while France took the same pledge with regard to Tripoli, about the *hinterland* of which England and France had already concluded a convention on March 21, 1899. Therefore, Tripoli is the only spot left to Italy for an opening on the Mediterranean into the African Continent. But how will she get it? Considering her present relations with France and England, which are chiefly interested in the Mediterranean, and her position as member of the Triple Alliance, she would now meet with no opposition from any of the Powers, if, on a pretext which it would not be difficult to create, she should send a force to occupy Tripoli. Of course, Turkey would not only protest, but would make a desperate effort to defend the last vestige of her conquests in Africa. An armed conflict would thus necessarily ensue, which is just what the ruling classes in Italy wish to avoid, knowing how much the people, since the unfortunate war with Abyssinia in 1896, are opposed to any colonial enterprises, which have to be carried out by military operations. Italy's ideal would be not to occupy Tripoli at all, if she could have the certainty that no other Power would go there. This certainty being impossible, and Italy desiring not to have recourse to a military occupation except in an extreme case, the tendency now prevailing is to go to Tripoli not only in accord with the other Powers, but even with the consent of Turkey herself. Negotiations in this sense have been initiated, and are still proceeding, with the Porte, Italy proposing to convert Tripoli into a centre for some of her emigrants who amount to 500,000 a year, and to take over a portion of the administration of that region to insure the emigrants the safety of their lives and property and equitable justice, but maintaining intact the sovereignty of the Sultan.

In this way, without eliminating Turkey, Italy would be so established in Tripoli as to render its occupation by any other Power impossible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON, *May, 1905.*

THE topics of chief importance from a national view-point that have been discussed in the Federal capital during the month of May have been—aside from the Loomis-Bowen affair, that, conceivably, might affect the reputation of our diplomatic representatives abroad—the President's avowed determination to insist upon clothing the Interstate Commerce Commission with power to regulate railway rates, in spite of the adverse position which the Senate Committee, headed by Mr. Elkins, has seemed inclined to take; and, secondly, his firm support of Secretary Taft in the declared intention to buy all supplies needed for the Panama Canal in the cheapest market, a declaration which seems likely to arouse strenuous opposition on the part of the "Stand Patters," as the inflexible upholders of the Dingley Tariff are called. The questions involved in the Bowen-Loomis controversy are, obviously, three. First, Are the charges brought against the First Assistant Secretary of State well founded? Secondly, Whether the charges were, on their face, justified or not, was Minister Bowen responsible for their publication in newspapers? Lastly, was Mr. Bowen simply performing a public duty, or was he aiming to gratify a private grudge, when he twice laid these charges before the State Department? The third inquiry may be quickly answered. Of course, a Minister is not expected to let personal animosity tinge his correspondence with the Secretary of State, or even to repeat to his official superior frivolous gossip that may be circulated in a foreign capital about his predecessor. If, on the other hand, the charges are serious, he is plainly bound to report them to the State Department. The second inquiry, also, need not detain us long. A Minister's whole duty is performed when he makes charges known confidentially to the Secretary of State. It, evidently, is not his business to comment on them in private conversation with foreigners, while, as yet, his official superior has reached no decision on the matter. To go further, and instigate the publication of the charges in newspapers, would be a gross breach of decorum, for which the only adequate punishment would be dismissal from our diplomatic service.

That the charges are serious there is no dispute, and it may be that Mr. Bowen can prove that he is guiltless of discussing them in private conversation, much less of revealing them to the public in advance of an official scrutiny. In that event, he will deserve

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to retain the confidence of the Federal Executive; and, although he will not be sent back to Caracas, where he is known not to be *persona grata,* he will doubtless be transferred to some other honorable post. The question of grave importance to Mr. Loomis is whether the charges, which have unquestionably been current in Venezuela, have any solid foundation. There has been a widespread impression that the accusations were thoroughly investigated and dismissed by the President himself some time ago, when they were first communicated by Mr. Bowen. It is now asserted that the investigation was not thorough, but that the President confined himself to asking an officer of the Asphalt Trust, Mr. Avery D. Andrews, who had served with him as a member of the New York Police Board under Mayor Strong, whether his Company had ever given any money to Mr. Loomis when the latter was United States Minister at Caracas. Mr. Andrews is said to have replied in the negative, explaining that, for convenience in the matter of exchange, Mr. Loomis had merely exchanged checks with the Trust. Thereupon the President dropped the subject, and the rebuke to Minister Bowen followed. Subsequently, Mr. Bowen again reported the charges, but the State Department took no notice of them. The publication of them in newspapers ensued. For that publication, however, Mr. Bowen repudiates any responsibility. He further asserts that from the documents in the case, forwarded by him and presumed to be in the archives of the State Department, two of the most material are missing. One of these was a letter from President Castro to Mr. Loomis, and the other was an "assignment" made by Mr. Loomis to another man. It seems that Mr. Bowen brought with him from Caracas duplicate copies of the missing documents, and that he has been permitted by Judge Taft, who, it is well known, is acting as Secretary of State in Mr. Hay's absence, to put them in evidence. The outcome of the controversy is uncertain at the hour when we write, though we may take it for granted that, if Mr. Loomis succeeds in proving his innocence, the wrong of which he has been the victim will be redressed by promotion in the Government service.

When our last article was penned, it was evident that the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, over which Mr. Elkins presides, and which has been for some time sitting in Washington, had been pretty well convinced by the representatives of the rail-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ways that any such legislation as is projected in the Esch-Townsend bill is superfluous, and that nothing is needed to safeguard the interests of shippers against unfair discrimination beyond the zealous enforcement of existing laws by the Interstate Commerce Commission. At that time the President had not been heard from, for he was still engaged in hunting bears in Colorado. Scarcely had he emerged, however, from the wilderness when he announced, in a public speech, the purpose of adhering to the policy embodied in the Esch-Townsend bill. The purpose of the Administration was subsequently reiterated by Secretary Taft at the banquet of the International Railway Congress in Washington. The latter utterance was the more noteworthy because Mr. Stuyvesant Fish, who presided, had argued that the railroads were private property, that their owners had vested rights, and that those rights would be encroached upon unfairly, if the power to fix rates, or, in other words, the prices at which services were to be sold, were delegated to agents of the Federal Government. Judge Taft replied that, while railways are, in a sense, private property, the courts have always recognized that they are created for public purposes, which must, above all things, be subserved. He added that, inasmuch as the commerce of the country must be carried on over their lines, and because, in the nature of the case, there cannot be such full and free competition between railways as between manufacturers or merchants, no enlightened nation permits railroads to be managed as though they were exclusively private enterprises. The Secretary of War did not advocate the creation of a Government Board or Commission, authorized to fix in advance the tariffs of all interstate railways; but he did maintain that, where a particular rate is denounced by shippers as unreasonable, and is so held by the courts, the determination of what rate would be a fair one is practically inseparable from the decision that the rate complained of is unreasonable. What the Secretary demanded was what the President had previously called for—namely, a means of making immediately effective the Commission's decision that a specific rate is unreasonable, though he acknowledged that this decision should be subject to review by a court. This, of course, is a proposal very different from the assertion that the Interstate Commission should be authorized to fix rates generally; yet the President, speaking at Denver, warned his hearers that even this limited judicial func-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion should be exercised by the Commission with great caution, and with due regard to the rights of railway shareholders, who, he called to mind, have lost hundreds of millions of dollars in constructing railways that did not pay. Mr. Roosevelt also cautioned his Denver audience against attacking railway companies on the ground that they are rich, or in a spirit of populism or socialism. The community at large, he said, should not overlook such rights of private ownership as the shareholders and bondholders in railway properties undoubtedly possess. Judge Taft also made it evident to the representatives of railways, with whom he foregathered at Washington, that he spoke as a friend when he suggested that they should acquiesce in some such measure of supervision as is embodied in the Esch-Townsend bill, lest worse should befall them at the hands of exasperated voters.

Though the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, which has been examining the question, may report against the adoption of the Esch-Townsend bill, it is likely to suggest a substitute and will shrink from an attempt to organize the Republican majority in the Upper House of the Federal Legislature in defiant opposition to Mr. Roosevelt's railway policy. It is by no means certain that such an attempt would succeed even in that body. Many Western Senators are known to approve of the President's position on this question, and it may well happen that others will be instructed by their State Legislatures to support him. We can see no reason, either, why all Democrats in the Senate should not take a similar stand, as their political *confrères* did in the last House of Representatives. Apparently, no change has occurred in the views of Mr. Williams, the leader of the Democratic minority in the Lower House, or in those of Mr. William J. Bryan and other authoritative spokesmen of Democratic sentiment. The current of public opinion is flowing quite as strongly in favor of Mr. Roosevelt's railway programme as it flowed last winter, and it may be well for recalcitrant Senators to remember that the President will again have an opportunity of appealing to the voters, when he makes his Southern tour which is expected to precede the convening of the Fifty-ninth Congress on October 10th, the date now understood to have been fixed upon.

The friends of railway corporations are few compared with the champions of the Dingley Tariff. Even the members of the Cabinet are said to be divided regarding the expediency of carry-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing out the plan proposed by the Secretary of War and approved by the President—the plan, namely, of purchasing the supplies needed by the Panama Canal Commission in the cheapest market, which, as it happens, would generally mean a foreign market. Judge Taft deems it his plain duty to act upon this principle, inasmuch as the Fifty-eighth Congress, though requested, omitted to legislate on the subject, and seems, therefore, deliberately to have left the matter to the Secretary's discretion. We presume, however, that no court of equity would hold that the Secretary's discretion would permit him to pay more for the Commission's supplies than he needs to pay. Such wastefulness would be especially inexcusable at this time when the Federal revenues already fall considerably short of meeting expenditures. Under the circumstances, Judge Taft would rightly feel it to be iniquitous for him to buy steam-engines, for example, directly from the American manufacturers, when those manufacturers are offering precisely similar engines in Europe at a greatly reduced price. How could he expect his accounts to be audited, if, without any positive mandate from Congress, he insisted upon putting in the pockets of American manufacturers the difference, often a wide one, between their home prices and their foreign prices for the same article? If the Fifty-ninth Congress choose to make American manufacturers a present of the people's money, let it do so openly, and shoulder the responsibility. That is an alternative which the "Stand Patters" would prefer not to confront. They would have liked the Canal Commission to buy quietly all of its supplies in the United States, and thus, while "keeping good money at home," avert any public ventilation of the subject. In view, however, of the upright and resolute position taken by Secretary Taft, with Mr. Roosevelt's cordial approbation, they will have to face the music, no matter how unwelcome and discordant it may prove. The members of the Cabinet who are said to be much annoyed at the projection of what they deem an inconvenient question into the forum of debate are Secretaries Shaw, Metcalf and Wilson. It is well known that Mr. Shaw has never given countenance to proposals for tariff revision. On the contrary, he has missed no opportunity for giving aid and comfort to the "Stand Patters," and it is no secret that he hopes to become their candidate for the next Republican nomination for the Presidency. It has been taken for granted that,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in furtherance of his aspirations, he would resign from the Cabinet before the next Presidential campaign, to give himself time to organize his canvass. As for his supposed coadjutors, Messrs. Metcalf and Wilson, they possess relatively little influence, personally or politically. On which side Secretary Morton may choose to array himself for the moment is, also, of trivial concern, inasmuch as, since he confessed himself guilty of giving rebates, and thus of violating a Federal statute when he was traffic manager of a railway, his retention of a place in Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet has been generally pronounced morally indefensible, and his resignation is looked for at an early date. There is no doubt that Attorney-General Moody and Postmaster-General Cortelyou concur with Secretary Taft and the President in considering it the Canal Commission's duty, in the absence of legislation to the contrary, to buy its supplies where it can get them cheapest. The same thing is believed to be true of Secretary Hitchcock, and there is no doubt that Secretary Hay will take a similar position when he returns to Washington. Whether the Fifty-ninth Congress will ever enact a law expressly ordering the Canal Commission to make American manufacturers a free gift of the difference between the prices asked by them at home and the prices they willingly accept abroad for the same commodities, is, to say the least, very doubtful. Such a bill might possibly pass the Senate, which is the stronghold of the high protectionists, and in which the votes of Mr. Gorman, Mr. McEnery and some other Democrats might, conceivably, be secured. But how is it possible that such a preposterous measure could obtain a majority in the next House of Representatives? It is true that Mr. Grosvenor, one of the four engineers of the House machine, has come out flat-footed in favor of the project; but the Republican whip, Representative Tawney, may be counted upon to oppose it, and it is quite possible that, out of deference to the President, a similar position would be taken by Representative Payne. How Speaker Cannon will view the matter is, as yet, unknown; but it is scarcely probable that so sagacious a politician, who has Presidential aspirations of his own, would put himself on record as conniving at what the voters are certain to regard as a "rank steal" from the Treasury. As for the Democrats in the House, they are as likely to support the President on this question as they were to uphold his railway-rate programme in the last Congress.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED